John Carter Brown.

76

by Paul de Rapin-Thoyras
N. Tindal trans-

see Albert Matthews letter of
April 25, 1913

Evans 12753

No 12
T. Greenleaf 95

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

Riſe, Progreſs, Views, Strength, Intereſts and Characters, &c.

OF THE

WHIGS and TORIES.

1773

95

A DISSERTATION

ON THE

Riſe, Progreſs, Views, Strength, Intereſts and Characters,

OF THE

Two PARTIES

OF THE

WHIGS and TORIES.

BOSTON:
Printed for *Joſeph Greenleaf*, and ſold at his *Printing-Office*, in HANOVER-STREET.
M,DCC,LXXIII.

JOHN CARTER BROWN

A DISSERTATION ON THE Riſe, Progreſs, Views, &c. OF THE WHIGS and TORIES.

THE government of *England* is of a particular kind, of which there is not the like at preſent in all the world. It is, however, the ſame which was formerly eſtabliſhed in all the kingdoms of *Europe*, formed out of the ruins of the *Roman* empire. The preſent difference between *England*, and other ſtates, in this reſpect, is owing to this, that the *Engliſh* have preſerved the form of their government ever ſince their ſettling in *Great Britain*; whereas in other nations, it has been loſt by degrees, or extremely altered. This government, which has ſo long ſubſiſted in this iſland, appears, in ſome reſpects monarchial, in others republican; and yet, properly ſpeaking, it is neither. It cannot be called purely monarchical, ſince the nobility and the people have a ſhare in the legiſlative power jointly with the king, nor can the king impoſe any tax, without the people's conſent. Neither is it republican, ſince there is a king, who exerciſes the ſovereign authority, who diſpoſes, as he

pleaſes, of all places and dignities eccleſiaſtical, civil, or military ; and can make peace or war, without conſulting his ſubjects. It would be therefore in vain to pretend to diſcribe this government, by the uſual names of monarchy, ariſtocracy, or democracy, which agree not with it. It is a mixed government, differing from, and yet compoſed of, all three. The prerogatives of the ſovereign, and the privileges of the nobles and people, are ſo tempered together, that they mutually ſupport one another. At the ſame time, each of the three powers, concerned in the legiſlature, may inſuperably obſtruct the attempts of one or both the others, to render themſelves independent. In ſhort, it is very near the ſame form of government, eſtabliſhed by the *Saxons* in *Germany*, by the *Francs* in *Gaul*, by the *Viſigoths* in *Spain*, by the *Oſtrogoths*, and after them, by the *Lombards* in *Italy*. Theſe nothern nations introduced this government into the moſt ſouthern parts of *Europe*, when they ſettled there, and founded new ſtates upon the ruins of the *Roman* empire.

If, therefore, it be aſked, How long this government has been in *England* ? I ſhall not ſcruple to anſwer, ever ſince the *Anglo-Saxons* finiſhed the conqueſt of that part of *Great Britain*, which their deſcendents poſſeſs to this day. It is true, a doubt may ariſe, whether the commons, in the time of the *Anglo-Saxons*, were part of the parliament ; and I confeſs this point is hard to be determined. But, however, when *England* was divided into ſeven kingdoms, *Engliſh* and *Saxon*, each of theſe had its king and parliament. This laſt was called the *Wittena-Gemot*, or *aſſembly of wiſe-men* ; and there was alſo the like for the common affairs of the whole *Heptarchy*. This ſame form of government ſubſiſted, when the ſeven kingdoms were reduced to one and the ſame ſtate. *The fields of mars* [*March*] or of *May* called ſince the ſtates general in *France* the cortes in *Spain*, and perhaps the diets of the *German* empire, are the remains of this ancient form of government

introduced by the northern nations, wherever they ſettled.

William, duke of *Normandy*, ſirnamed the *Baſtard* or *conqueror*, having ſubdued *England* in 1066, became abſolute, and eſtabliſhed a deſpotic power, though, in all likelihood, he preſerved the ſhadow of a parliament. To ſecure his conqueſt, he tranſplanted many *Normen*, *French*, *Breton*, and *Angevin* families, enriching them with the lands, of which he inceſſently diſpoſſeſſed the *Engliſh*. Theſe tanſplanted families multiplied greatly in a ſhort ſpace, and became in the end ſo powerful, as to make head againſt their ſovereigns, ſucceſſors of the *conqueror*. At firſt, they gloried in their entire dependence upon the king, who had put them in poſſeſſion of their lands. Their intereſt required, that they ſhould ſupport that power by which they held all their *Engliſh* poſſeſſions. But when they were once firmly ſettled, they began to dread, that the regal power, which had enriched them, might with the ſame eaſe ſtrip them of their eſtates, if the king ſhould ſo pleaſe. For this reaſon, they wiſhed, the govenment reſtored to the ſame ſtate, as in the times of the *Saxon* kings. This was the only means to avoid the inconveniences of an arbitrary power, (which might, in time to come, turn as much to their prejudice, as it had to their advantage) and to perpetuate the poſſeſſions of their lands. What at firſt was only a bare wiſh, ſoon roſe into hope, and at laſt into right, by the methods I ſhall preſently ſpeak of. To explain this fully, a large detail of the *Engliſh* hiſtory would be neceſſary, and a particular enumeration of all the cauſes which have contributed to put the nobility, and afterwards the people, in poſſeſſion of a right, which they did not enjoy, under the firſt *Norman* kings. But as this detail would lead me too far, I ſhall content myſelf with a ſhort abridgment, concerning the ſubject in hand.

William the conqueror, in 1087, left the kingdom of *England* to his ſecond ſon *William*, ſirnamed *Ruſus*, in prejudice of *Robert* his eldeſt ſon who had only *Normandy*. *Robert* made ſome attempts to diſpoſſeſs his brother of a crown, of which he believed himſelf unjuſtly deprived. But *Rufus* defeated them by his addreſs engaging as well the *Normans* as the *Engliſh* in his intereſt, with promiſes of re-eſtabliſhing the ancient government, and reviving the *Saxon* laws. He knew that both were paſſionately deſirous of what he made them hope. By the *Normans*, I mean here the foreigners newly ſettled in *England*. This promiſe of *Rufus* was therefore the firſt foundation of their pretenſions. I ſay the firſt, for the *Normans* had no right to demand of the king what he was pleaſed to promiſe them, and the conquered *Engliſh* had as little, to limit the power of their conquerors. It is true, the *Engliſh* might ground their pretenſions upon ſome general promiſes made them by *William the conqueror*, when he received their firſt homages. But this prince never pretended that they ſhould found a right on theſe promiſes. Accordingly, he always treated *England* as a conquered nation. However, *Rufus* kept his word with neither *Normans* nor *Engliſh*.

Upon his death *Henry* I, his younger brother aſcended the throne in 1100, in prejudice of his eldeſt brother *Robert*, ſtill alive. To ſecure his uſurpation, he purſued the ſame courſe as his predeceſſor *Rufus*. He promiſed to reſtore the ancient government, and confirmed his promiſe by a charter in form, but executed it no better then his brother. However, the rights of the ſubject received ſtrength from theſe promiſes, though ill perfomed.

Henry I. dying, *Maud* his daughter, widow of the emperor *Henry* V, and wife to *Jeffery Plantagenet* earl of *Anjou*, ought to have mounted the throne; but in 1135 was defeated of her right by *Stephen* earl of *Boulogne*, ſon of the conqueror's eldeſt daughter. He bound himſelf more ſtrongly than his two prede-

ceſſors to reſtore the *Saxon* laws, but in all appearance with as little intention to perform his engagements. At laſt, the great men, finding he ſought pretences to evade his promiſes, harraſſed him with a war which laſted the moſt part of his reign. In the beginning, they called into *England* the empreſs *Maud*, and her ſon *Henry* by the earl of *Anjou*; and the war ended in a treaty, which ſecured the crown to *Henry* after *Stephen*'s demiſe though he had ſons.

To *Stephen*, in 1154 ſucceeded *Henry* II. During his reign, and that of his eldeſt ſon *Richard* I, there were no conteſts between the king and the barons, for ſo the great men of the kindom were then called. But very conſiderable diſputes aroſe in the reign of king *John*, ſirnamed *Lacland*, brother and ſucceſſor of *Richard* I. An unhappy quarrel between this prince and the court of *Rome*, having forced him to do homage to Pope *Innocent* III. for his kingdom, and bind himſelf to pay him tribute, this diſhonorable proceeding, added to many other cauſes, loſt him the eſteem and affection of his ſubjects. The barons improved ſo favourable a juncture, preſented to him the charter of *Henry* I, which had never been executed, and reſolved to oblige him to confirm it. *John* at firſt rejected it with great haughtineſs, but at laſt compelled by his own weakneſs, and the united oppoſition of almoſt all the barons, he was obliged to grant them a charter, much more ample and advantageous to the ſubject, than *Henry the firſt's*, and which was called *magna charta* or the *charter of liberties*. By this charter, drawn as the barons pleaſed, the king's power was ſo curbed, that it was in a manner reduced to the ſame ſtate as under the *Saxon* kings before the conqueſt. This charter has been ever ſince the principal foundation of the rights of the ſubjects. I ſhall not here pretend to decide a queſtion ſo much above my reach, whether this foundation is very ſolid. It will ſuffice briefly to remark, by what means a conceſſion

ſeemingly ſo defective in it's origin, ſince it was evidently extorted, changed as I may ſay it's nature by the firmneſs of the *Engliſh*, and acquired an indiſputable authority, though it might have been conteſted at firſt. To this end, we muſt ſee what paſſed afterwards with reſpect to this charter.

King *John* who had ſigned it, deſiring to revoke it, drew upon himſelf freſh misfortunes, which laſted as long as he lived. The barons reſolved to adhere to their charter, took at laſt a deſperate courſe to call in to their aſſiſtance, *Lewis*, Son of *Philip Auguſtus*, king of *France*, and to put him in poſſeſſion of all, or the greateſt part of the kingdom. *John* died during the war, deprived by a foreign prince, or rather his own ſubjects, and left a ſon of ten years of age, little capable to maintain the quarrel. Some lords, who had remained faithful to the late king, appointed the earl of *Pembroke*, regent during the minority of the young prince, who was recognized by his few adherents by the name of *Henry* III. in 1216.

Shortly after the face of affairs was changed, by the prudent conduct of the regent, who ſeeing the barons bent to ſupport their charter, promiſed poſitively, it ſhould be confirmed and executed. Upon this aſſurance, they deſerted prince *Lewis*, who was obliged to return to *France*.

Henry III. was no ſooner out of his minority than he repealed *magna charta*, and thought of reigning uncontrouled. But as he had not a capacity equal to ſuch an undertaking, his long reign of fifty ſix years was one continued ſcene of troubles on account of *magna charta*. He was frequently forced to confirm it, and as often broke all his oaths and engagements. At laſt, the barons took arms under the conduct of the earl of *Leiceſter*, ſon of the famous *Simon Montfort* general of the cruſade againſt the *Albigenſes*. The king had the misfortune to loſe a battle, and to ſee himſelf, his brother the king of the *Romans*, and his ſon prince *Edward*, in the hands

f the earl of *Leiceſter*, who obliged them to ſwear, they would never oppoſe the execution of *magna charta*. The earl of *Leiceſter* governed ſome time in the name of the king his priſoner. It is pretended the commons were firſt received into parliament during his adminiſtration. But without ſtaying to examine ſo difficult a queſtion, I ſhall only obſerve, that at leaſt it cannot be denied, that ſince the end of *Henry* III's reign, the commons have ever enjoyed this privilege.

Prince *Edward*, ſon of *Henry* III, having happily made his eſcape from the earl of *Leiceſter*, gained a battle in which the earl was ſlain. This victory reſtored the king to his liberty, who uſed it not agreeable to the oath he had been obliged to take. But his reign and life ended a few years after his deliverance. Though the baron's party was very much humbled, yet *Edward* I. who in 1272 ſucceeded his father *Henry* III. confirmed *magna charta*. However ſome ſteps taken by him afterwards, diſcovered a deſign to revoke it; but the barons beginning to ſtir, he retracted, and confirmed it once more.

Edward II, his ſon, and ſucceſſor in 1307, was depoſed by the parliament, for intending to eſtabliſh an abſolute power contrary to *magna charta*.

Edward III, ſon and ſucceſſor of this unfortunate prince in 1327, confirmed it ten times during the courſe of his reign, which the victories obtained by himſelf and his ſon the prince of *Wales*, over *Erance*, rendered extremely glorious.

Richard II, grandſon and ſucceſſor to *Edward* III. in 1377, was ſolemnly depoſed, for having violated in many inſtances the privileges of the people, founded on *magna charta*.

Henry IV, who had uſed that pretence to dethrone *Richard* II. in 1399, and put himſelf in his place, made ſome attempts to diminiſh the privileges of the parliament; but did not carry very far the execution of this project.

Henry V, his ſon who ſucceeded him in 1413, maintained the parliament in all it's rights, and left the privileges of his ſubjects untouched. His reign was one continued ſeries of victories, and ſucceſſes againſt *France*. He died in 1422.

From that time the government of *England* remained ſo well ſettled, and ſo firm upon it's foundations, I mean, the prerogative of the king, and the privileges of the parliament, that for near two hundred years, not one king appears to have had any intention to ſhake it. The policy of the kings, turned wholly upon governing their parliaments by ſecret intrigues, without diſcovering any deſire of altering the conſtitution. True it is, that ſome kings, as *Henry* VIII, did what they pleaſed, but without any prejudice to the privileges of parliament. On the contrary, by ſupporting the parliament in it's rights, they had the addreſs to make it ſubſervient to their ends. This, by the way, is the beſt, and perhaps the only method for a king to render himſelf powerful and eaſy.

After ſo long a continuance of the ſame form of government, and ſo uninterrupted a poſſeſſion of the privileges of *magna charta*, the *Engliſh* nation was ſo accuſtomed to it, that it ſeemed impoſſible to make any alteration without throwing the kingdom into confuſion. Nay, it ſeemed there was no fear that any king ſhould ever think of attempting ſo difficult a thing, at the hazard of his crown, as had been the caſe of ſome former kings. Notwithſtanding all this, *James* I, ſucceſſor to queen *Elizabeth* in 1603, failed not to take ſome ſteps in this dangerous courſe, and endeavour to diminiſh the privileges of parliament. It was by the pernicious counſels of the duke of *Buckingham*, his favorite, that he engaged in this deſign, which probably would have ended unfortunately for him, had not death ſurpriſed him before he had plainly diſcovered his intention. This duke of *Buckingham* ought to be conſidered as the firſt author of the troubles, which have ſo long infeſted *England*, and ſtill do infeſt it to this day.

It was under *Charles* I, ſon and ſucceſſor of *James* in 1623, that the project to render the king abſolute, and independent of the laws, was vigorouſly puſhed and advanced by all methods. The duke of *Buckingham*, favourite to *Charles* I, as he had been to his father inſpired him with maxims directly contrary to the eſtabliſhed government and thereby occaſioned his ruin. The duke being aſſaſſinated, the deſign was purſued by *Charles*, which had been begun by the deceaſed favourite. He imagined, the nation might be governed without a parliament, or at leaſt that parliaments were only to ſupply him with money. He had diſſolved three in the four firſt years of his reign, and even ſignified his intention of calling no more. Twelve years paſſed without a parliament, during which the king levied taxes by the bare act of his will, upon his ſubjects, and by his conduct diſcovered a deſign to reign arbitrarily. Unhappily for him, he admitted to his perſon and council two men imbued with the ſame maxims, by whom he was puſhed on to his ruin; namely, *William Laud* archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Thomas Wentworth* earl of *Strafford*.

While this prince had no difficulties to ſtruggle with from abroad, he enjoyed his uſurped power with ſome tranquility, but not without the open murmurings of the people. Mean time, no perſon dared to oppoſe ſo violent a torrent. At laſt, the archbiſhop of *Canterbury* adviſing him to finiſh the reſtoration of the *Scotch* hierarchy, and introduction of the *Engliſh* liturgy, he followed the pernicious advice, but could not execute his project without engaging in an open war in 1639, with his ancient kingdom of *Scotland*. He levied forces, and maintained them by taxes, which he himſelf had impoſed. Money failing him after the firſt campaign he at laſt in *April* 1640, called a parliament which was diſſolved in a few days, for the ſame reaſon as the three firſt, and the arbitrary impoſitions continued as before. But the king quickly perceived,

that the continuation of his power, depended upon the happy ſucceſs of his arms. The people ſerved him with regret. The lords on divers pretences withdrew from court. The validity of his orders, by virtue whereof his impoſitions were levied, were conteſted in town and country. In ſhort, the king ſaw his ſubjects every where ready to deſert him, on the firſt occaſion.

This occaſion preſented itſelf ſooner than he expected. His army having received a check, and the *Scots* ſurpriſed *Newcaſtle*, the king was forced to ſeek means to drive them out of *England*, whereas he had hoped to become abſolute in *Scotland*. But inſtead of finding his *Engliſh* ſubjects ready to aſſiſt him, he ſaw them on the contrary rejoice at his diſgrace, and conſidered it as a proper opportunity to recover their privileges. In this extremity, he aſſembled the peers at *York*, in order to adviſe with them upon what was to be done. Their unanimous opinion, was, that the only way to free himſelf from the preſent difficulties, was to call a parliament. He then perceived, that an interval of fifteen years was not capable to efface out of the minds of the *Engliſh*, the memory of their parliaments, which they looked upon as the ſtrongeſt ſupport of their liberties. Mean while, he was under a ſort of neceſſity to follow the advice of the peers, in calling a parliament.

In the preſent diſpoſition of the people to the king, ſuch repreſentatives were choſen, as were eminent for their ability, courage, and firm attachment to the privileges of the ſubject. The parliament being met, inſtead of thinking to drive the *Scots* out of the kingdom, as the king had hoped, believed they ought, before all things to ſecure the liberties of the nation, by ſetting bounds to the illegal authority, which the king had for fifteen years aſſumed. This reſolution was no ſooner diſcovered, than all the people adhered to the parliament. From that time the king was ſo deſtitute of friends, that he ſaw himſelf unable to reſiſt the torrent. His only

refuge was, to comply with his parliament, and paſs almoſt every bill preſented to him to curb his authority. He hoped, by this condeſcention, to convince his ſubjects of his intention to return to the ancient courſe, from which he had been diverted by evil counſels, and perhaps he really deſigned it, but could gain no belief. On the contrary, it was thought, that mere neceſſity obliged him to meaſures ſo oppoſite to the former. So, mutual confidence, ſo neceſſary between the king and his people, being entirely loſt, the parliament would no longer depend upon the ſincerity of a prince, whom they believed they had juſt cauſe to diſtruſt. They therefore inceſſantly laboured to ſecure the liberties of the ſubject from any future invaſion. To this end, they were not ſatisfied with obtaining the king's conſent to acts which reduced the royal power within it's ancient limits, but alſo extorted his aſſent to laws, which conſiderably leſſened the juſt prerogatives of the crown. The friends of the parliament ſcrupled not to affirm, that the ſubject could never be ſecure in his property, while the king had power to return to his former courſes. Thus king *Charles*, who had hoped to carry the royal authority higher than any of his predeceſſors, ſaw himſelf, on the contrary, deprived of great part of his legal power. He even had the mortification to ſee himſelf forced, in *May*, 1641, to ſign the earl of *Stafford*'s ſentence, who had acted nothing without his orders, or at leaſt his approbation. The archbiſhop of *Canterbury* alſo, loſt his head on the ſcaffold in 1644.

Had the parliament contented themſelves with ſettling the government upon it's ancient foundations, very probably, it would not afterwards have been eaſily ſhaken. But on ſuch occaſions it is difficult to keep a juſt medium. The leading members willing to ſcreen themſelves from the attempts of the royal power, almoſt entirely changed the ancient conſtitution, by ſtripping the crown of the beſt part

of it's prerogatives. It was no longer the king and parliament which governed the nation, but the parliament alone, or rather the houſe of commons, managed all affairs. The houſe of peers had ſcarce any other power, than that of an implicit aſſent to the bills offered to them, and the king was but a ſhadow of a ſovereign. However, it was this very thing that procured him adherents, whom doubtleſs, he would never have had, if the balance had been kept even. Many thought it as ſtrange that the parliament ſhould, as I may ſay, govern without a king, as that the king ſhould attempt to rule without a parliament. The conſtitution of the government, ſuffered equally by both uſurpations. But that which brought the ſtrongeſt acceſſion to the king's party, was, that the parliament, to gain the *Scots* to their intereſt, were poſſeſſed with the project, of changing the epiſcopal government of the church, into preſbyterian, which they accompliſhed with open force. Moſt of the *Engliſh* accuſtomed to ſee the church under the direction of biſhops, could not bear this change without murmuring. But as theſe were not the ſtrongeſt, becauſe the parliament had the treaſure, army, and places at their diſpoſal, their only refuge was to unite with the king.

Then it was that two parties appeared in the kingdom, one for the king, and one for the parliament, with a ſort of equality, which quickly made it thought, they would not long remain quiet, and without coming to arms. The king's adherents at firſt had the name of *cavaliers*, which was afterwards changed into that of *tories*. And thoſe of the parliament, then called *roundheads*, have received the name of *whigs*. The origin of theſe two famous diſtinctions is this: At that time a ſort of *Iriſh banditti*, or robbers, who kept in the mountains and iſles formed by the vaſt bogs of that country, were called *tories*, and at preſent are known by the name of *rapparees*. As the king's enemies accuſed him of fa-

vouring the *Iriſh* rebellion, which broke out about that time, they gave his adherents the name of *tories*. Theſe, on the other hand, to be even with their enemies, who were cloſely united with the *Scots*, called them *whigs*, a name of reproach uſed in *Scotland*. Hence it appears, that theſe two names are as ancient as the troubles, though they were not in vogue till many years after. I cannot preciſely fix the time, but am of opinion, that cavalier and roundhead, continued till the reſtoration of *Charles* II, and then by degrees, were changed into tory and whig. Theſe are the two parties which began to divide *England* in the time of *Charles* I, and which ſtill divide it to this day. The *Roman* catholick called papiſts in *England*, joined, from the firſt, the king's party, which was more favourable to them than that of the parliament, and have always remained united with the tories.

What has been ſaid, ſufficiently ſhows, that the king's party was compoſed of two ſorts of men, of which the one had principally in view the political intereſt of the king and the crown and the others that of the church of *England*. But they were all re-united in this point, that they found their mutual advantages in the king's proſperity, without which they could not hope to ſucceed in there reſpective deſigns. For this reaſon, they were conſidered but as one party under the ſame name of cavaliers or royaliſts. This mixture of two defferent views in the ſame party, ſubſiſts to this day and is not one of the leaſt cauſes of that confuſion of ideas which the word *Tory* occaſions. To remove this ambiguity as much as is poſſible, I ſhall call the firſt, the *political or State cavaliers*, and the other the *eccleſiaſtical* or *church cavaliers*. Each of theſe two branches were again ſub-divided. For among the political cavaliers there were ſome who following the maxims of the duke of *Buckingham*, Archbiſhop *Laud*, and the earl of *Strafford*,

wiſhed to ſee the king inveſted with abſolute power and able to deſtroy the privileges of the parliament. Theſe may be called the rank cavaliers. Their number was ſmall and little capable to ſupport the king in his adverſity though during his proſperity, they made a great noiſe. The other branch of the political cavaliers, were compoſed of men whom I ſhall call moderate. Theſe deſired indeed the reſtoration of royal authority, but according to the ancient conſtitution. The other cavaliers, whom I call eccleſiaſtical, were alſo ſubdivided into two branches, one of which was compoſed of rigid churchmen, who were againſt the leaſt change in the diſcipline of the church of *England*. Thoſe who compoſed the other branch were leſs ſcrupulous and obſtinate, and may be called the low or moderate churchmen.

In oppoſition to the cavaliers or royaliſts, the roundheads, or parliamentarians, were divided into two principal branches, namely, the political and eccleſiaſtical. The firſt had principally in view, the maintenance of the rights of the people, and the ſecond, the advancement of preſbytery. Each of theſe branches was likewiſe ſub-divided into two, one wherof was compoſed of republicans, who aimed at undermining the regal power, and erecting a common-wealth; the other of the moderate roundheads, or parliamentarians, deſired only to reduce the king to an incapacity of abuſing his power by leaving him the poſſeſſion of his juſt rights. This relates only to the political roundheads, or parliamentarians. As for the eccleſiaſtical they alſo formed two branches, of which the firſt was compoſed of the rigid preſbyterians who would be contented with nothing leſs than the deſtruction of the *Hierarchy*; and the other, of the moderate preſbyterians, who would have been ſatisfied with much leſs, and perhaps, with a bare toleration. It was abſolutely neceſſary to premiſe thus much, in order to enable the reader to underſtand the ſe-

quel of this diſſertation. I ſhall more largely ſpeak of the views and intereſts of the different branches of the two parties, after I have finiſhed the abridgment which their riſe obliged me to interrupt.

Whilſt the king was in a deplorable ſtate, without money or friends, and reduced to bear every thing from the parliament, who had him as I may ſay, in their mercy, he beheld a ray of hope ſhine in the riſe of the two parties, I have been ſpeaking of. He thought immediately, that to foment the diviſion could not but be advantageous to him, wherein he ſucceeded. He thereby ſaw himſelf at laſt in a condition to hope to do himſelf juſtice, by his arms, for the injuries of which he thought he had reaſon to complain. In this expectation he raiſed an army, and engaged in an open war againſt the parliament, who on their ſide had now taken all the neceſſary meaſures to reſiſt him.

The particulars of this war are needleſs here, ſince the ſad concluſion of it is ſtill recent. It will ſuffice to ſay, that *Charles* I, was vanquiſhed, and beheaded the 30th of *January* 1648. Thus the king himſelf, the duke of *Buckingham*, the earl of *Strafford*, archbiſhop *Laud*, authors of the project to render the king abſolute, came all to a tragical end. If to theſe we add, the examples of *John*, *Henry* III, *Edward* II, *Richard* II, and laſtly, of *James* II, who had all the ſame deſign, and all miſcarried in the execution, it will be eaſy to ſee how difficult and dangerous it is for a king of *England*, to attempt to ſubvert ſo well cemented a government.

Oliver Cromwell, author of *Charles* I's death, remained maſter of the government. He durſt not however aſſume the title of king; and if he had the addreſs to render himſelf abſolute, it was under the ſpecious pretence of maintaining the nation's liberties. He is the ſingle inſtance in *England*, of an uſurper dying a natural death in his uſurpation.

While the ſovereign authority was in *Cromwell's* hands, the cavaliers were extremely humbled. But

they revived on the death of this formidable enemy. To give their adverſaries no advantage againſt them, they put themſelves under the conduct of thoſe of their party, who were the moſt moderate, ſo that there ſeemed to be no more rank or rigid tories. This policy was abſolutely neceſſary, at a time, when the royal prerogative, and the rights of the church were not to be inſiſted on, as there were neither king nor biſhops. At laſt, by a moſt ſurprizing revolution, aſſiſted by the prudent conduct of general *Monk*, the *Engliſh* united to ſet *Charles* II. on the throne, ſon of the deceaſed king, and to reſtore the monarchy and the church to their former ſtate.

Charles II. reigned peaceably at firſt. He was a prince who wanted neither wit nor penetration, but was indolent, and addicted to his pleaſures. His intention was to live quietly, and avoid all diſputes with his ſubjects. He was too weary of a long exile, during which he had often wanted common neceſſaries, to be willing to hazard the being again reduced to the ſame ſtate. On the other hand, the *Engliſh* had time, and frequent occaſion, to open their eyes, and diſcover, that by a pretended maintenance of their liberties, they had been drawn into ſervitude. For it may be affirmed, that *England* had never enjoyed leſs freedom, than under the government of the long parliament, and afterwards of *Oliver Cromwell*. However, *Charles* II. engaged himſelf by degrees, farther than he ever intended. This, doubtleſs, was owing either to his indolence, or too great condeſcenſion to his miniſters, who were all cavaliers, whom, for the future, I ſhall call tories, as I ſhall give the roundheads the name of whigs, though I do not know exactly when theſe two names were at firſt uſed. The tories therefore, who alone were in the king's confidence, were inceſſently urging him to reſtore the monarchy and church to their ancient luſtre. The court of *France*, for intereſts of their own, laboured to inſpire him

with the ſame deſign. In a word, his miniſters took great care to hinder the whigs from inſinuating themſelves into the king's favour.

The tory party had at their head the duke of *York*, the king's brother, a prince naturally impetuous and violent, who having embraced the *Roman* catholick religion in his exile, formed the project of eſtabliſhing it in *England*. This project could not be executed, without firſt extending the royal power beyond the bounds preſcribed by the law, that is to ſay, without reſuming and purſuing the ſame deſign, wherein his father had unhappily miſcarried. But the Duke, by reaſon of his impetuous temper, was very improper to conduct ſuch an undertaking. He purſued it eagerly during his brother's reign, who had no legitimate iſſue, hoping that the work then begun, would be more eaſy to finiſh on his own acceſſion to the throne.

To ſucceed in this deſign, he had no other way than to begin it with the utter ruin of the whigs, whoſe principles were directly contrary to the duke's deſigns, both with regard to the church and the ſtate. It muſt be obſerved, that moſt of the whigs were then preſbyterians. So, in pretendingonly to attack preſbyterianiſm, the duke of *York* projected the deſtruction of thoſe who oppoſed the increaſe of regal power, without alarming the nation. Indeed after humbling the whigs, he might fear to meet with great obſtacles from the moderate tories, whoſe principles did not entirely agree with the arbitrary power he intended to eſtabliſh. But he deſpaired not to ſurmount, if the whigs, his more dangerous enemies, were once removed out of the way. To this end, he induced his brother to perſecute the preſbyterians, wherein he was aſſiſted by all the tories, who with pleaſure beheld this firſt occaſion of being revenged on their enemies, the whigs. So preſbyterianiſm was furiouſly attacked, under a pretence of reſtoring the church to the ſtate it was in before the troubles. An act was paſſed, forbid-

ding the preſbyterian aſſemblies, which were called *conventicles*; and another known by the name of the *teſt-act*, which indeed more directly concerned the *Roman* catholicks. This act ordained, that no perſon ſhould be admitted to any public office, without producing a certificate of his having communicated in an epiſcopal church. Moreover, it was called the conformity act, becauſe all who were to be admitted to any office, were obliged by this ſtatute to conform to the church of *England*.

The whigs ſoon perceived, that under colour of maintaining the rights of the church of *England*, the duke of *York*'s deſign was to change the government of the ſtate, and ruin the proteſtant religion in *England*. It required ſome time to take juſt meaſures; and at laſt, with the aſſiſtance of the moderate tories, who feared the duke of *York*'s going too far, they obliged the king to ſend him out of the kingdom. Nay, the commons prepared a bill, called the *excluſion bill*, to deprive him of the right of ſucceſſion. But the paſſing this bill was prevented by the diſſolution of the parliament. Another was called at *Oxford*, in expectation of finding the members leſs violent. But the king was miſtaken, and, after a ſhort ſeſſion, was again obliged to diſſolve them, upon their endeavouring to paſs the like bill.

It will perhaps ſeem ſtrange, that the ſcene ſhould be thus changed, and the whigs who were extremely low, ſhould ſuddenly become ſuperior. To let the reader into the reaſon of this change, it is neceſſary to remark, that the moderate tories promoted the deſigns of the court, while they believed them levelled only againſt the preſbyterians. But perceiving by all the proceedings of the king, the duke of *York*, and the miniſters, that a project was formed to ruin the conſtitution of church and ſtate, and undermine the foundations of *magna charta*, they readily joined with the whigs to oppoſe the execution of this project. It was therefore this union

which gave the whigs a ſuperiority, to which, otherwiſe, they never could have pretended. On the other hand, the ſtate-tories and rigid churchmen, deſiring to recover the ground they had loſt, endeavoured to gain the people to their intereſt, by accuſing the whigs of a ſettled deſign to ruin the church, and theſe in their turn accuſed the others, of intending the ſubverſion of the government, and of favouring the duke of *York*'s pernicion deſign. Thus the enmity of the parties, which ſeemed to have been much weakened by the reſtoration, was revived. It may truely be ſaid, that the tories were in fault, who, to revenge the wrongs received from the long parliament, and *Cromwell*'s uſurpation, raſhly threw themſelves into the duke of *York*'s party. They afterwards repented, when they ſaw to what the duke intended to make them ſubſervient.

Some time after, the minds of the people being a little calmed, the duke of *York* returned into *England*, and continued without interruption to foment diviſions, without which he could not hope to effect his deſigns. So this prince (by an exceſs of zeal for his religion, by a deſire of revenge, and perhaps excited by the ambition of accompliſhing a project, which had been in vain attempted by ſeveral kings of *England*) and *Charles* II, through a too great condeſcenſion to his brother, kindled a flame in *England*, which is not yet extinguiſhed.

Charles II, died during theſe tranſactions, and the duke of *York* aſcended the throne, by the name of *James* II, without any oppoſition. He at firſt made great promiſes to his ſubjects, that neither religion, nor the conſtitution, ſhould ſuffer any change in his reign. But he was far from performing his promiſes. Shortly after, the duke of *Monmouth*, natural ſon of *Charles* II. relying on the diſcontent of the people, left the *low countries*, where he had lived ſome time in exile, made a deſcent in *England* with a handful of men, and aſſumed the title of king. But his royalty laſted but a few days. His party be-

ing much weaker than he had expected, he was defeated, taken, and beheaded. The king was ſo elated by a victory, obtained with ſuch eaſe, that he ſcrupled not to diſcover his deſigns, ſo ſecure did he think himſelf of the ſucceſs. The judges, who were devoted to him, gave their opinion, that the king might diſpenſe with the laws. Their deciſion was founded upon ſome ſtatutes lodging this power in the ſovereign, with regard to certain laws; and upon examples of ſome of his predeceſſors, who had, in this reſpect, exceeded the bounds of their power. Thus theſe corrupted judges drew from particular caſes a general concluſion, and founded a permanent right upon ſome tranſient uſurpations.

This door being opened, the king, by his ſole authority repealed the penal laws, enacted by ſeveral parliaments to prevent the deſigns of the papiſts. He next filled his army with officers of that religion, and beſtowed preferments and titles upon men, who by the laws were unqualified. He took away the charters from *London*, and other corporations, and reduced them to a dependance upon his pleaſure. In ſhort, by a bare proclamation he granted a full liberty of conſcience, and permitted to each ſect the public profeſſion of their religion. This proclamation had a double view, to favour the papiſts, and to amuſe the preſbyterians. The king was perſuaded, that as the latter were ſtill liable to the penal laws enacted againſt them in the late reign, they would be glad to be freed from them, and that the fear of forfeiting the liberty granted by the proclamation would keep them in ſubmiſſion. But they were not deceived by an artifice directly tending to their ruin. I omit many other ſteps taken by the king, which were but too capable to fill all his ſubjects with terror.

Hitherto the tories in general had favoured the king's deſigns. But when they perceived all his proceedings tended to a ſubverſion of the eſtabliſhed

government, and ruin of the proteſtant religion, they began to repent of their paſt conduct. They clearly ſaw, that by the courſe they were made to take, it was intended to lead them where they deſigned not to go, and that they could not attain their end, the ruin of the whigs, without the loſs of their religion and liberty. In this danger, which could not be more immient, they joined the whigs, and with them reſolved to call in the prince of *Orange* to free them from their dangerous ſtate. From that time the king's party became extremely weak, being compoſed of only papiſt's, rank tories, and ſome lords, ſlaves of the court, and their fortune. Mean while, the king appeared outwardly as powerful as ever, and near the end of his undertaking; becauſe thoſe who yet ſeemed attached to the court, did not think proper to declare before the time. The prince of *Orange* was landed before the king's weakneſs was viſible. His army, his fleets, the lords whom he thought moſt devoted to his perſon, forſook him at once, and he was reduced to the ſad neceſſity of trying, in a diſgiſe to eſcape out of his kingdom. But failing even in this attempt, he had the mortification to ſee himſelf at the mercy of the prince of *Orange*, and, in all appearance, indebted to his generoſity, or perhaps his policy, for the indirect means which were furniſhed him, of flying into *France*. This example ſhows, that though the *Engliſh* are divided into two parties, and there is great enmity between them, their paſſion does not however cauſe them, in general at leaſt, to abandon the intereſts of religion and liberty.

William and *Mary* being crowned, on the flight or, as it was called, the abdication of king *James*, their chief care was to ſtifle the ſeeds of diviſion ſtill ſubſiſting between the whigs and tories, though the danger had united them. In order to this, it was neceſſary to remove from the miniſtry and

their confidence, the favourers of king *James*'s deſigns, and the bigots to the minuteſt rites and ceremonies of the church of *England*. Without this, the whigs could never have enjoyed any quiet, ſince they ever conſidered the rank and rigid tories, as their irreconcileable enemies. On the other hand, it was not leſs neceſſary to remove from the council the moſt rigid whig preſbyterians, for fear of giving occaſion to think, there was a deſign to change the church-government. This fear would have been the more juſt, as the new king having ever profeſſed in *Holland* the preſbyterian religion, the leaſt ſtep in it's favour, might have raiſed a ſuſpicion of his deſigning to eſtabliſh it upon the ruins of the national church. Great addreſs was therefore to be uſed to remove all cauſes of fear and jealouſy in the tories. It was for theſe purpoſes, that during the reign of *William* and *Mary*, the offices were generally conferred on the moderate men of both parties. This maxim was purſued by king *William* when he reigned alone, after the queen's death. But as it was impoſſible to pleaſe both parties at once, unleſs there had been more places to give, he affected frequently to change his miniſtry and employ the two parties alternately. This was all he could do, till time ſhould have extinguiſhed entirely the flames of diviſion.

Under ſuch circumſtances, and a king of ſuch wiſdom and foreſight, it may be almoſt affirmed, that no diſturbance would have happened to the government from the difference of the principles of the two parties, if the church-tories could have been contented with ſeeing their church remain eſtabliſhed. But they could not be ſatisfied, ſo long as they ſaw the preſbyterians enjoy an entire liberty of conſcience, publicly exerciſe their religion, and fill offices, contrary to the conformity act of *Charles* II. They were jealous that the whigs intended by degrees to undermine the church, and that the king concurred with them in that deſign.

What they had ſeen during the long parliament gave them occaſion to fear the ſame attacks. The rank tories having loſt king *James*, their patron and defender, inſpired the epiſcopal party with theſe fears and jealouſies, to animate them againſt king *William*. They perceived, they were no longer able to ſupport themſelves, unleſs means were found to ingage the church in their quarrel. Hence the rumors induſtriouſly ſpread among the people, of the church's being in danger. The whigs ſaw by this, that the rank tories had not relinquiſhed their projects, but would, when ever they were armed with power, make uſe of the pretence of religion to ruin them, in imitation of king *James*. It was thus, that animoſity was continued between the two parties, notwithſtanding king *William*'s care and endeavors.

It ſeemed therefore, that religion was then the ſole point in queſtion between the two parties; the junctures not allowing either the rank tories, or the republican whigs, to puſh their principles. This has given occaſion to a falſe idea of the differences between the two parties, and to an imagination, that they ſolely conſiſt in a diverſity of ſentiments concerning church government. But this is certainly a miſtake. When an opportunity offers, the rank tories ſhow, that the ſafety of the church is not the ſole motive of their conduct, and probably the republican-whigs would alſo remember their maxims, at a favorable juncture.

As to the papiſts, who may be conſidered as a branch of the tories, they have had reaſon to be ſatisfied with king *William*'s moderation, if their extreme deſire to ſee king *James* again on the throne, had not cauſed them to look upon the reigning king as their enemy. Some of them were even ingaged in conſpiracies againſt his perſon, which only turned to their own confuſion and ruin. This immoderate deſire expreſſed by the papiſts, and even by ſome tories, for the reſtoration of king *James*, obliged king *William* to ſeek means, not only for the pre-

vention of their ill deſigns during his life, but alſo to render their endeavours fruitleſs after his death. Accordingly, by an act of parliament the ſucceſſion of the crown was ſettled in the illuſtrious houſe of *Hanover*, without any regard to the pretentions which birth or nearneſs of blood could give to any papiſt whatſoever. *William* died ſhortly after, and *Anne*, daughter of *James* II, and princes of *Denmark*, mounted the throne.

This queen had been educated in the principles of the rigid tories with reſpect to religion, and probably in thoſe of the rank tories, with regard to government. At leaſt all who had any power over her, or were concerned in her education, were of this character. *Charles* II, her uncle, *James* II, her father, the earl of *Rocheſter*, her mother's brother, were all rank tories, deeming any oppoſition to the ſovereign's will, a manifeſt rebellion. Queen *Anne* was beſides of no great capacity, and naturally obſtinate. An accidental quarral with her ſiſter queen *Mary*, having made her reſolve to withdraw from court, ſhe was ſo punctual to her reſolution, that ſhe would not even viſit the queen her ſiſter, when on her death-bed. The meanneſs of her genius foretold the power which her miniſtry would have in the government. On the other hand, her education made it feared, ſhe would be guided by the rank and rigid tories, of whom her uncle the earl of *Rocheſter*, was conſidered as the head. This lord was equally dreaded by the whigs and moderate tories, as a dangerous man, and capable of carrying things to extremities. He was otherwiſe a perſon of great parts, but very fond of his principles. Probably he was going to be at the helm of the government, by the acceſſion of the queen his niece to the throne. But it is pretended that the fear of the moderate tories to ſee him in ſo high a poſt, made them reſolve to join with the whigs, to prevent it. At leaſt it is certain, that ſuch an union was made, which forced the queen to throw

herſelf into their arms, and truſt them with the management of affairs. I am a ſtranger to the intrigues uſed to bring the queen to theſe meaſures. The lords, *Godolphin*, *Marlborough*, and ſome other leaders of the moderate tories, were among thoſe who joined the whigs, and ſtrengthened them more by their ability, than their credit and numbers, from this time, the moderate tories and the whigs made but one party.

It is needleſs to relate here, with what glory to *England*, and to the queen in particular, theſe new miniſters directed the public affairs. This is a thing univerſally known, and the memory of it is ſtill recent. But it is preſented, that by reaſon of the meanneſs of the queen's genius, they held her in a kind of ſervitude, though they outwardly affected to give her the honor of all her glorious ſucceſſes. During their adminiſtration, the rank and rigid church-tories were excluded from all civil imployments, and eccleſiaſtical dignities. Had this continued to the death of the queen, theſe two branches of the tory party would doubtleſs have been conſiderably leſſened in number and credit.

Mean time, the queen ſaw herſelf, not without ſome impatience, forced, as it were, to follow the counſels of thoſe whom ſhe had a right to command, and who, if public report is to be credited, left her not free to purſue her own inclinations or judgment. The rank tories perceiving, or perhaps ſuggeſting theſe ſentiments to the queen, induſtriouſly cheriſhed her diſcontent, by the aſſiſtance of a certain lady, who was in her confidence. Such was their ſucceſs, that after they had ſatisfied her, that ſhe was a ſlave, they brought her to a reſolution of freeing herſelf. This intrigue was conducted with ſuch art and ſecrecy, that her miniſters found themſelves ſupplanted, before any meaſures could be taken to prevent their ruin. Immediately their places were filled with rank and furious tories. The parliament, in which the whigs had a great ſupe-

riority of votes, was diſſolved, and another called, to which the new miniſters took care to have members returned devoted to their party. Any perſon, ever ſo little acquainted with the affairs of *England*, knows what influence the court has in the elections. It may, however, be affirmed, that in reſpect of number, the party of the miniſtry was ſtill inconſiderable. But they had the queen and the parliament on their ſide. Beſides, they were very careful to ſtrengthen their party, by infuſing jealouſies on the account of religion, and perſuading the epiſcopalians that the church had been in great danger, during the late adminiſtration, and would always be ſo, as long as the whigs had any ſhare in the government. Theſe inſinuations revived the paſſion of the church-tories, and carried them to ſuch exceſſes againſt the preſbyterians, as ſhould not be allowed in a well ordered ſtate, but which theſe miniſters affected to connive at. Indeed, their deſign was not to leſſen, but rather to increaſe the animoſity between the two parties, becauſe their own was thereby ſtrengthened.

Hitherto every thing ſucceeded to the wiſh of the new miniſtry. But they were very ſenſible, that the preſent advantages procured by theſe imaginary terrors would be of no long continuance. Beſides, though they could have kept the people always in this diſpoſition, the queen might die very ſoon, eſpecially as ſhe was very infirm. In that caſe, they had reaſon to fear, the fabrick they had raiſed, would be demoliſhed, by the elector of *Hanover*, who was to ſucceed the queen, by virtue of the act of ſucceſſion, for which he was chiefly indebted to the whigs. They were therefore to think of preventing this danger without loſs of time. Their party was too weak to ſtruggle with the ſovereign, ſhould he happen to be againſt them, as had been often ſeen during the reign of king *William*, and in the firſt years of queen *Anne*. They therefore concluded, at leaſt, if we may judge

by their proceedings, that their ſureſt way would be to ſecure the crown to the pretender, in order to have a protector when the queen ſhould fail them. It is however ſtill uncertain, whether the earl of *Oxford*, that able miniſter, now in the *tower*, was of this opinion. But it cannot be denied, that they believed the aſſiſtance of *France* to be abſolutely neceſſary for their ſupport. Accordingly, to ſecure it, they made a diſhonourable and haſty peace to the aſtoniſhment of all *Europe*, and forced the allies of *England* to follow her example. Probably, had not the queen died ſo ſoon after the peace, the oppreſſed whigs would have been obliged to call in to their aſſiſtance, the elector of *Hanover*, as they had before the prince of *Orange*, but with far leſs hope of having the general concurrence of the people. The reaſon is, becauſe king *James*'s deſign to ſubvert the church and ſtate, was ſo open, that it could not be doubted, whereas againſt the pretender there were only bare preſumptions.

What has lately happened ſince king *Grorge*'s acceſſion to the throne, ſhows there was a formed deſign to ſecure the ſucceſſion to the pretender, and had not the death of the queen happened, before the authors of it had time to take all their meaſure. It is however uncertain, whether they could have executed their deſign, or whether, if they could, the pretender's reign would have been of any long continuance. The *Engliſh* in general are extremely jealous of their laws and liberties, nor are they leſs ſo of their religion. This is what I think I may venter to affirm, though ſome of them ſeem indifferent as to the latter. But, thanks be to God, theſe are far from being the majority. Now it would have been very difficult for the pertender, advanced to the throne by foreign aid, profeſſing a religion contrary to the national, and guided by rank tories, to keep himſelf within the bounds of moderation, neceſſary to gain the hearts of his ſubjects, without which a king of *England* can never ſit

firmly on his throne. However, without ſtaying to gueſs what might have happened, let us only obſerve that the rank and rigid tories have been diſappointed. Not only, the pretender is not king, but his hopes of becoming ſo were never leſs. King *George* is in peaceable poſſeſſion of his crown; the tories are humbled, and the whigs, lately oppreſſed, are now at the top of the wheel.

After this brief account of the riſe and progreſs of the tories and whigs, it will not perhaps be unacceptable to the reader to know more particularly the views, intereſts, ſtrength and characters of the two parties. For this purpoſe the different branches before mentioned muſt be carefully diſtinguiſhed. It is therefore neceſſary to repeat here that the two parties, may be conſidered under two different relations; namely, with reſpect to the ſtate, and with regard to the church. I ſhall firſt ſpeak of the ſtate-tories and whigs, after which, I ſhall conſider them with reſpect to religion.

The ſtate-tories are, as I ſaid, divided into two branches, one of which may, in *French*, be called *rank*. In *England* they are known by the name of high-flyers. This idea, taken from birds, that by ſoaring above the common flight, loſe themſelves in the clouds, is very ſuitable to men, who cannot contain themſelves within the limits of the eſtabliſhed government. Theſe are for having the ſovereign abſolute in *England*, as he is in *France*, and ſome other countries, and for erecting his will into law. They regard not what I have ſaid in the beginning of this diſſertation, that all the governments at this day in *Europe* were originally like that eſtabliſhed in *England*; and conſequently there is no reaſon why the *Engliſh* ſhould imitate nations who have ſuffered it to be loſt, or at leaſt very much altered. It may be imagined that in ſuch a country as *England*, this party cannot be very numerous, and yet they are very conſiderable for three reaſons. Firſt, becauſe the heads of this party are perſons of the high-

eſt rank, and commonly favorites and miniſters of ſtate, or ſuch as hold the greateſt offices at court, and the moſt eminent dignities in the church. Theſe men who would not willingly put themſelves under the conduct of others, being thus advantageouſly ſituated, become, generally, the leaders of all the tory-party. They manage them as they pleaſe, not only for the advantage of the whole party, but chiefly for their own particular ends. Thus, very often, under pretence of acting for the intereſt of the party, their proceedings tend only to their own advantage, and the tories are led by them much farther than moſt of them deſire. It is this which gives occaſion to many perſons to accuſe all the tories of being for arbitrary power, though it is certain that only the high-flyers are chargeable with this principle. But it is no great fault, it ſeems, to aſcribe to a whole party what is done by their leaders.

Secondly, This particular branch of tories is conſiderable, in that, when they are in the miniſtry, they ingage the church-tories ſtrenuouſly to maintain the doctrine of paſſive-obedidnce, which goes a great way towards gaining the people to their party. They inſinuate to the epiſcopal miniſters, that they have only in view the ruin of the preſbyterians, and under that pretence cauſe them to preach a doctrine, the conſequence of which extends to all the ſubjects. This was experienced in the reigns of *Charles* II, of *James* II, and of queen *Ann*, towards the concluſion.

Laſtly, The party of the high-flyers becomes very powerful, when as it frequently happens, they are ſupported by the king, and then it is that the liberty of the nation is in danger. Proofs of this, have been ſeen in the reigns of *James* II, *Charles* I, *Richard* II, *Edward* II, and *Henry* III; for the high-flyers are more ancient than is imagined.

The ſecond branch of the ſtate-tories is compoſed of thoſe I called moderate. Theſe are for having the king enjoy all his prerogatives, but they pretend not, with the high-flyers, to ſacrifice to him the privileges of the ſubject. They are true *Engliſhmen*, who have the welfare of their country at heart, and are for preſerving the conſtitution tranſmitted to them by their anceſtors. They have often ſaved the ſtate, and will again ſave it, when in danger, from the rank tories or republican whigs, by oppoſing with all their power thoſe who ſhall attempt to alter the government. It would be injuſtice, to confound them with the high-flyers under the general denomination of tories.

As there are two branches of ſtate-tories, ſo there are two of ſtate-whigs, namely, republican, and moderate whigs. The republican whigs are the remains of the party of the long parliament which endeavored to turn the government into a commonwealth. Theſe at preſent are ſo inconſiderable that they ſerve only to ſtrengthen the other whigs with whom they uſually join. The tories would perſuade the public, that all whigs are of this kind. And in like manner, the whigs would have it believed that all tories are high-flyers. But this is only an artifice to render one another mutually odious.

The ſecond branch of the ſtate whigs contains the moderate whigs, who are nearly allied to the moderate tories in principle; and conſequently are to be conſidered as true *Engliſhmen*, who deſire, the government may be maintained upon it's ancient foundations. Herein they would be exactly like the moderate tories, were it not that theſe incline more to the king, and the moderate whigs, to the parliament. The moderate whig is perpetually hindering the people's rights from being invaded, and ſometimes even takes precautions at the expence of the crown. By him the triennial act was procured, with ſome others, which it is need-

leſs to mention, to prevent the abuſe of the royal power. Hence it is evident that the high-flyers have no greater enemy than the moderate whig, and that theſe two branches of whigs and tories properly form the oppoſition between the ſtate-tories and ſtate-whigs. Theſe laſt laugh at paſſive-obedience when it's conſequences are carried too far. Their principal is, that the royal power has it's bounds, which cannot be tranſgreſſed, without injuſtice. Conſequently they believe, that whenever the ſovereign exceeds his prorogative, he may be reſiſted by his ſubjects. Hence it is eaſy to infer, they do not think the king can diſpenſe with the laws.

What has been ſaid is ſufficient to ſhow that the moderate ſtate-whigs and tories are almoſt of the ſame ſentiments. Their being of different parties proceeds from their mutual fear that either may make the ballance incline too much to the king's or parliament's ſide. It is not therefore ſtrange, that theſe two branches of the oppoſite parties, unite in the preſſing exigencies of the ſtate. For, their views equally point to the preſervation of the government; though often they purſue their end by different paths. Accordingly ſince the union of theſe two branches upon the death of king *William*, they have remained inſeparable, and the moderate whig and tory form almoſt the ſame party, under the common appellation of whig. I dare not however affirm that there are not yet moderate tories who keep by themſelves, and are unwilling to be confounded with the whigs.

It muſt be remembered that hitherto I have only ſpoke of the tories and whigs in relation to the government, without any regard to religion. I take care not to confound things which ought to be carefully diſtinguiſhed. It is not true that all church-men are tories, or all preſbyterians, whigs in point of government, as is commonly imagined. Many preſbyterians are in this reſpect of the ſame

principles with the moderate tories, and would not be leſs concerned to ſee the king ſtripped of his prerogatives, than the ſubject of his privileges. In like manner many church-men, even biſhops themſelves, are whigs, very good whigs as to the government, and as conſidered in oppoſition, to the high-flyers, which ſhow the neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing ſtate-tories and whigs, from church-whigs and tories, of whom we are now going to ſpeak.

I preſume the reader knows that the church of *England*, when ſhe received the reformation, admitted only ſome alterations in her doctrine, but preſerved the hierarchy with all the ceremonies in which ſhe ſaw nothing ſuperſtitious. The reformation was not properly compleated till the reign of *Elizabeth*. Then it was that ſeveral conſtitutions of the convocation, confirmed by acts of parliament, ſettled the public worſhip as it ſtands to this day. Mean while, many *Engliſhmen* who had fled from the rage of queen *Mary*, returned home with favorable ſentiments of the reformation, as eſtabliſhed in *France*, *Switzerland*, *Geneva*, and other parts of *Germany*. Theſe men could not comply with the reformation in *England*, which, in their opinion, had not been carried far enough from the church of *Rome*. For this reaſon they not only abſented themſelves from the aſſemblies of the eſtabliſhed church, but alſo compoſed ſeparate aſſemblies, which were called conventicles. Theſe ſeparatiſts were likewiſe ſtiled preſbyterians, becauſe, refuſing their ſubmiſſion to the biſhops, they maintained that all prieſts or miniſters had an equal authority in the church, which ought to be governed by preſbyteries, or conſiſtories, compoſed of *miniſters* and *lay-elders*. Upon this occaſion were two parties formed, who, wanting the mutual forbearance of perſons, profeſſing in the main the ſame religion, began to moleſt one another with diſputes in conference and writing. The church-of-*England*-men were very angry, that private perſons ſhould pre-

tend to reform what, after minute deliberation, had been eſtabliſhed by national ſynods and parliaments. On the other hand, the preſbyterians thought it no leſs ſtrange, that they would be compelled to practiſe what they believed contrary to the purity of religion, and with what their conſciences could not comply. The preſbyterians were long oppeſſed, becauſe their adverſaries ſupported their arguments with reaſons from the authority of the queen and parliament.

The preſbyterians conceived great hopes of the acceſſion of *James* I. becauſe that prince had always profeſſed their religion whilſt he reigned in *Scotland*. But as he readily conformed to the church of *England*, they were not much eaſed. Mean while, this party, though oppreſſed, ſo increaſed, that in the beginning of the troubles they were become very numerous. King *Charles* I. was ſo attached to the church of *England*, that it may be affirmed, he died a martyr to it, as is evident from his hiſtory. His opinion of the purity of this church, made him hearken to *William Laud* archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, ſuggeſting to him the reduction of the church of *Scotland* under the ſame government with that of *England*, by introducing the hierarchy. This undertaking ingaged him in a war with *Scotland*, and the war produced the long parliament, againſt which he thought himſelf obliged to take arms. This parliament wanting the aſſiſtance of the *Scots*, could not obtain it but by an engagement to make the church of *England* preſbyterian. A quarrel was therefore ſought with the biſhops, deans and chapters, in a word, with the whole church of *England*, which ſaw it's hierarchy, eſtabliſhed by queen *Elizabeth*, entirely ſubverted, and the *Scotch* preſbyterian govornment introduced. In this diſtreſs the epiſcopalians had no other reſource than to unite the epiſcopal party with the king's party, and as they had one common intereſt with the cavaliers, namely, the maintenance of the king's cauſe, they were

confounded with them under the ſame party denomination. The preſbyterians were in the like manner reckoned among the roundheads, becauſe they adhered to the parliament.

During the long parliament, and even to the death of *Cromwell*, the diviſion of the branches juſt mentioned, was hardly perceived. All who were known by the name of roundheads, or parliamentarians, were rigid preſbyterians and republicans. This was the party then in vogue, and the only one that could prefer ſuch as aſpired to the poſts in the gift of the parliament. In like manner the followers of the king's party appeared to be rank cavaliers, or rigid epiſcopalians, becauſe theſe were then moſt regarded at court. But on the reſtoration of *Charles* II. the ſeveral branches of the two parties began to be diſtinguiſhed. All being tired with the troubles which had ſo long harraſſed the kingdom, the moderate no longer feared to diſcover their ſentiments. Some of the preſbyterians teſtified a readineſs to relax, and many epiſcopalians were of opinion that, for the ſake of peace, ſome condeſcenſion might be uſed to the preſbyterians. Theſe therefore were the men of both parties, who preſerving this moderation, formed the two branches of the moderate whigs and tories, with reſpect to religion. But ſtill the majority in both parties; firmly adhered to their principles with inconceivable obſtinacy. Amongſt the epiſcopalians there were, who, upon no account whatſoever, could be perſuaded to recede in the leaſt from the practiſe of their church. On the other hand, there were preſbyterians who were no leſs offended at ſeeing a miniſter officiate in a ſurplice, than at hearing him preach hereſy, and who branded with the name of idolatrous and ſuperſtitious, every ceremony retained by the church of *England*. This gave birth to the two branches of the rigid epiſcopalians and preſbyterians, which ſubſiſt to this day. The hierarchy is the princi-

pal point, on which they are divided. They are both compriſed under the name of whigs and tories, becauſe the rigid epiſcopalians join with the tories, and the preſbyterians with the whigs.

From what has been ſaid concerning the ſeveral branches of whig and tory, it is eaſy to gather that theſe two names are very obſcure and equivocal terms, becauſe they convey, or ought to convey to the mind different ideas, according to the ſubject diſcourſed of. For inſtance, if I hear it ſaid, that the tories and whigs are at great enmity, this raiſes in my mind an idea comprehending all the ſeveral branches of whigs and tories in general. But if I am told, the tories are for having the king abſolute and independant, or that the whigs would be glad the regal power were aboliſhed, my idea can only extend to the high-flyers and the republican-whigs. The reſt of the whigs and tories would doubtleſs be offended at any ſuch imputations. In like manner, if I hear that the tories had rather ſee a papiſt on the throne than a proteſtant, favorable to the whigs, I ſhould injure the tories in general, by imputing ſuch a thought to them, which can only be entertained by the popiſh and ſome rigid church-tories, and perhaps ſome high-flyers. Laſtly, if I hear that the whigs aim at the ruin of the church of *England*, I can underſtand this only of the preſbyterian whigs, ſince the epiſcopal whigs, amongſt whom are ſeveral biſhops, cannot of juſtice be accuſed of laboring the ruin of their own church. Thus the names of tories and whigs convey to the mind certain confuſed ideas, which few are capable of rightly diſtinguiſhing. But this difficulty ſtill increaſes, when it is conſidered that the ſame perſon may be either whig or tory, according to the ſubject in hand. A preſbyterian, for inſtance, who wiſhes the ruin of the church of *England*, is certainly for that reaſon in the whig-party. But if this preſbyterian oppoſes with all his power, the attempt of ſome of his party, againſt the regal authority, it cannot be denied that he is in

that reſpect a true tory. In like manner, when the church only is concerned, the epiſcopal party are to be conſidered as tories. But how many even of theſe are whigs with reſpect to the government? Nor have foreigners only ſuch confuſed ideas in this matter; the *Engliſh* themſelves are liable to them. Nothing is more frequent than to hear a whig charging all the tories in general with an intention to deſtroy the rights and liberties of the ſubject; and a tory arraigning the whigs without diſtinction, as utter enemies to the church and ſtate. Every man uſes this confuſion of ideas, occaſioned by the names of whig and tory, to accuſe his adverſaries of what is moſt odius in both parties.

Having ſhown as diſtinctly as I could, what is to be underſtood by the tories and whigs, I am next to examine the ſeveral motives and intereſts of the two parties. Were we to rely on what is ſaid by both, nothing is more juſt, more equitable, than the motives by which they are actuated, namely, the glory of God, the honor of the king, the public good and the welfare of the nation. For my part, if I may ſpeak my mind, it is my belief, that as they are all men, intereſt is the main ſpring of all their actions. Since the two parties were formed, each has earneſtly laboured to gain a ſuperiority over the other, becauſe this ſuperiority is attended with poſts, honors and dignities which are conferred on their own members by the prevailing, in excluſion of thoſe of the contrary party. This made king *William* ſay, that, *If he had places enough to beſtow he ſhould ſoon reconcile the two parties.* There would be yet another expedient to ſupply what that prince imagined, namely, to confer all the great places upon neutral lords. But where ſhall we find a ſufficient number of ſuch, who are qualified to exerciſe the higheſt offices? Certainly there are but very few. I own however, there are ſome, who, by their capacity, their impartiality, their diſintereſtedneſs, would deſerve a particular diſtinction.

I wiſh I knew them all, that I might inſert their names, and give them in part their due praiſe. But theſe lords, ſo worthy of being known, are little heard of in foreign parts, becauſe as they make their court to neither party, the public poſts generally fall not to their ſhare. Nevertheleſs, it ſometimes happens that miniſters are in a manner obliged to find out theſe neutral lords, and advance them to the firſt dignities in the kingdom. We know one eſpecially, who without ever courting the whig or tory miniſters, was ſent ambaſſador and plenipotentiary at the peace of *Ryſwick*, honored with the order of the garter, ſucceſſively raiſed to the offices of lord privy-ſeal, lord preſident of the council, lord high-admiral of *England*, and lord-lieutenant of *Ireland*, though he never ſollicited theſe great offices. I ſpeak of the earl of *Pembroke*, whoſe reputation is better known to me, than that of ſome other lords of the ſame character, who ought to receive no injury from my ſilence. Among all his other virtues, his integrity in the great poſts which he has filled, calls for much nobler encomiums than he can receive from a foreigner, who has neither the honor to know him perſonally, nor to be known by him. If there were in *England* twelve ſuch lords, advanced to the great offices, it would be an infallible means to humble both parties at once. Then the aſpirers to employments would make it a merit to eſpouſe neither party, and this impartiality would ſoon deſcend from the great men to the people. But this is a happineſs rather to be deſired than hopped. Neutrality, far from promoting perſons of diſtinguiſhed merit, is rather a ſure impediment to their riſing, becauſe the miniſters and party-leaders think only of gratifying their creatures.

Intereſt, as I ſaid, is the principal motive which actuates the two parties, and this is but too apparent. If, for inſtance, the high-flyers wiſh to ſee

the ſovereign in poſſeſſion of abſolute power, I very much doubt whether this flows from a deſire of procuring the welfare of the kingdom, though they ſhould be perſuaded that diſpotiſm is the moſt compleat form of government. If the public good was the ſole ſpring of their actions, they would not be ſo warm. The ſame may be ſaid of the other branches of the two parties. Each would have it believed, they have only the good of the kingdom in view, while in fact they are only laboring for themſelves, their family and poſterity. But when I ſay that intereſt is their principal motive, I pretend not to exclude entirely many others, which may actuate as well the heads as the members of each party. Some believe that their principles really tend to the good of the ſtate; others act from a religious motive; ſome are ſwayed by revenge, party-ſpirit, and the deſire of ſuperiority. Numberleſs other motives there are on which I think it needleſs to enlarge, that I may not be led to examine the conduct of particulars. It is certain, many may purſue the ſame end from different motives. It will be better to ſhow the ſtrength and ſeveral intereſts of both Parties. In order to this, it is neceſſary to proceed in this examination according to the different branches into which they are divided. I ſhall begin with the tories.

It is difficult at firſt to conceive, that in a country like *England*, bleſſed with ſo many noble privileges which other nations do not at preſent enjoy, there ſhould be men who wiſh to ſee the king inveſted with unlimited power. There are indeed but very few who openly profeſs themſelves to be of the party which I call high-flyers. Nevertheleſs it is but too true that ſuch a party has always been in *England*, and ſtill ſubſiſts, to this day, though diſowned by moſt of thoſe who are ingaged in it. Can it be denied that ſuch a party exiſted under *Charles* I? The very judges of the kingdom, who are conſidered as the interpreters of the law, gave

it as their opinion, that in caſes of neceſſity the king might impoſe taxes upon his ſubjects, and that the king himſelf is the ſole judge of ſuch caſes. This was rooting up the nobleſt prerogative of the parliament, and the principal cauſe of their frequent meetings. If the ſovereign could levy taxes upon his ſubjects, without authority of parliament, it may be affirmed, that their ſeſſions would be very rare, and perhaps in time, entirely ceaſe. But if the parliament were once laid aſide, what would become of the privileges and immunities of the ſubject? In all likelihood the caſe would be the ſame as in *France*, ſince the general aſſembly of the ſtates has been diſcontinued. Has it not alſo been ſeen under *James* II, that the judges, aſcribed to the king a power of diſpenſing with the penal laws? And was not this making him abſolute? In ſhort, we have ſeen *Charles* I, *Charles* II, *James* II, taking large ſteps toward arbitrary power which they would never have attempted, had they not expected to be ſupported by a numerous party. Let queen *Anne*'s proceedings in the laſt years of her reign be conſidered; for inſtance, the negotiation and concluſion of the peace of *Utretcht*, the creation of twelve peers at once, the violences uſed in parliamentary-elections, and, it cannot be denied that they were ſo many advances towards deſpotiſm, to which ſhe was excited by the party I am ſpeaking of. It is therefore certain, there is ſuch a party in the kingdom. But as they dare not openly avow their principles, they cover them with the pretence of maintaining the rights of the crown, to which they ſeem to confine themſelves, willing to have it believed that they are of the party of the moderate tories. But the principal high-flyers, being commonly favorites or miniſters of ſtate, it generally happens that they become heads of the whole party of the tories, and ingage them to do more than they would. They begin with attacking the preſbyterians, and ſo ingage the

church-tories, to follow their meaſures, without knowing whither it is intended to lead them. On pretence of having the diſſenters only in view, they cauſe the clergy to preach paſſive-obedience, which tends directly to arbitrary-power. It is this which renders the high-flyers more powerful than appears at firſt ſight. The main concern of them lies in drawing the church into their quarrel, by pretending an extreme zeal for her rights. They are thereby confounded with the church-tories, whoſe number is very conſiderable, avoid giving the alarm to the moderate tories, and keep themſelves undiſcovered till they have made the whole party ſubſervient to their particular deſigns. But for all this, notwithſtanding their care to obſerve what I have been ſaying, they have the misfortune never to arrive at the end of their career. After they have made themſelves leaders of the whole tory-party, and by ſecret paths, conducted the moderate and church-tories to a certain point, they are at laſt forced upon ſome proceedings which diſcover their deſigns. Then they loſe many of their followers, who not only deſert them, but go over to the *Whigs*. This was the caſe of *James* II, who ſaw himſelf ſuddenly abandoned by all the world, juſt as he thought himſelf ſecure of his ends. If in the laſt year of queen *Anne*, the high-flyers who governed in her name, had attempted to procure a repeal of the act of ſucceſſion, very probably, they would have met with the ſame mortification, and I do not doubt but the ſame thing will happen upon every the like occaſion. The reaſon of what I advance ſeems to me evident, namely, that it can be advantageous but to very few *Engliſhmen*, to have a popiſh or abſolute king.

The party or branch of the moderate tories much exceeds in number that of the high-flyers; whatever advantage this laſt may have from the quality of their leaders, the other is more powerful from the goodneſs of their cauſe, I mean the pre-

ſervation of the king's juſt prerogatives. This is properly the intereſt of all *Engliſhmen*, who cannot hope for greater happineſs under any other form of government, than under that which has been ſo long eſtabliſhed. This branch of the moderate tories becomes ſtill more conſiderable as often as any attempt is made to extend or to abridge the royal prerogative. If to abridge it, they are joined by all the whigs; if to extend it, they are aſſiſted by all the reſt of the tories. Nevertheleſs, it ſometimes happens, that the junctures produce ſome change in the principles, as well as in the intereſts of this party. When the ſovereign favors the tories in general, by conferring places and poſts upon them, nothing is capable to detach the moderate tories from his intereſt: But their affection cools whenever he inclines to the other ſide. Then, if they ſee the whigs, by a precaution common to them, make any attempt upon the prerogative royal, they are ready to join them. But herein their ſole aim is to let the king know that they deſerve his regard. This courſe was frequently taken by them in the reign of king *William*, who often changed ſides. In general, it is the intereſt of the moderate tories to oppoſe the attempts of the whigs againſt the authority of the ſovereign, becauſe this ſupports their credit at court and in the country. But withal they are to take care that the high-flyers do not, under the ſpecious pretence of being of the ſame name and party, carry them farther than is neceſſary.

As to the church-tories, it may eaſily be conceived that they include almoſt the whole kingdom in their party, ſince this branch conſiſts of all the members of the church of *England*. Therefore when religion is in queſtion, between the whigs and tories, the former are not able to reſiſt their adverſaries. To this ſuperiority is owing the readineſs with which the church-tories ſhow their reſentment againſt the preſbyterian whigs. It is not

ſo with the whigs, who even in their greateſt proſperity dare not ſo much as diſcover the leaſt thought of attacking the church. They did it once under the long parliament, and it will never be forgot by the tories. They look upon the whig-party as an enemy always ready to undermine the foundations of their church, and, from what was once done, infer the deſire of doing the like again, when a favorable opportunity preſents. This makes them ſo readily receive every impreſſion which from time to time is given them of the church's being in danger, and ſuffer themſelves to be ſo eaſily deluded on that account. Their leaders know ſo well how to improve this diſpoſition, that they project nothing in relation to the ſtate, without including the church. This is an infallible expedient to unite the whole party, which would be very much divided, were the government only concerned. This procured *Charles* I. many adherents, whom aſſuredly he would have wanted, had the parliament not attacked the church of *England*. Moreover it was this, which in the reign of *Charles* II. put the duke of *York*, though a papiſt, at the head of the epiſcopal tories, who willingly concurred with him in the deſtruction of their enemies. Whenever king *William* turned to the ſide of the whigs, the tories were full of imaginary fears of his laboring the ruin of their church. The ſame method was practiſed in the firſt years of queen *Anne*, becauſe the miniſtry was then compoſed of whigs or moderate tories. The ſame imaginary fear threw the epiſcopalians, towards the concluſion of that reign, into the ſchemes of men who had viſible no religion at all. In ſhort, on this very pretence, we lately ſaw in the reign of king *George*, a popiſh pretender called in to ſcreen the church of *England* from the pretended attempts, ſhe had to fear from the whigs. It is therefore religion which gives power to the tory-party. It is certain, if the ſecret of intereſting the church in the quarrel was not practiſed, the high-flyers would make a very

contemptible figure, and the difference between the whigs and moderate tories would cauſe none of thoſe diſturbances in the kingdom, which have ſo long prevailed.

It is true that among the church-tories, there are many who are very ſenſible of the artifices by which the whole party is ingaged in a quarrel, advantageous but to few. Of this number are thoſe, I call low church-men, among whom ſome poſſeſs the firſt dignities of the church. But they are not the ſtrongeſt. The party of the rigid church-men is much more numerous. This laſt branch conſiſts of almoſt all the inferior clergy, of ſome biſhops of both univerſities particularly that of *Oxford*, and theſe bodies draw after them a great number of the laity. It is theſe that compoſe what is called in *England*, high-church, that is, a church which has no mixture of preſbyterianiſm. Theſe men are ſo attached to the leaſt ceremony of the church of *England*, that they would not relax upon any thing whatſoever, and by this ſtiffneſs, they diſcover more of the ſpirit of party, than of zeal for religion. I will even venter to ſay, that many of them would rather chuſe to ſee *England* under popery than preſbyterianiſm. Now, as the low-church-men, though more moderate in their ſentiments, look upon the hierarchy as an eſſential point, it is not ſurpizing that the tories unite when the growth of *Whigiſm* is to be oppoſed, which has all the preſbyterians in it's party. It is, perhaps, an artifice of the ſtate-tories to have given, or at leaſt to continue with ſo much care, the name of tories to the epiſcopalians, in order to confound in the ſame party, intereſts of a different nature, becauſe this confuſion is very ſerviceable to them.

The papiſts are likewiſe conſidered as a branch of the tories, becauſe they always remain attached to that party. As they can never hope to ſee popery eſtabliſhed but by means of an abſolute king, it is not ſtrange that they rank themſelves with the high-flyers. Indeed, this aſſiſtance would not be

very conſiderable to the tories, if confined to the *Engliſh* papiſts, ſince enjoying neither places, nor votes in elections, they cannot have much credit. But this admiſſion of papiſts, ingages likewiſe foreign powers in the tory intereſt, who can on certain occaſions be very ſerviceable. Nevertheleſs it cannot be denied, that by this, the tories give their enemies great advantage againſt them, who uſe this pretence to render them odious.

If the leaders of the tory-party aimed only at maintaining the prerogatives of the king, and the rights of the church, it may be affirmed, that party would be invincible, becauſe that is the true intereſt of the kingdom. But as it ſometimes happens, that theſe are only pretences to cover other projects, leſs agreable to the good of the ſtate, when once their deſigns are diſcovered, their friends generally draw off, a diviſion of the tory-members being a neceſſary conſequence of ſuch diſcovery. This makes me think that it is almoſt impoſſibly they ſhould ever ſucceed in ſetting the pretender on the throne, or inveſting any king whatſoever with abſolute power. This opinion is founded upon it's not being the intereſt or deſire of the nation in general. And hence it is, that they ſo firmly eſpouſe the intereſts of *France*, becauſe they are very ſenſible they want her aſſiſtance. In was ſeen in the laſt war that the ill ſucceſſes of that crown were terrible mortifications to them, and therefore they endeavored, as much as poſſible, to leſſon them. Accordingly when they were at the helm, their firſt care was to cure the wounds, *France* had received. However, it is very difficult for *France* to put them in poſſeſſion of their wiſhes. *Great-Britain* is an iſland which can hardly be attacked unawares; and which, while there is a good underſtanding between the king and the parliament, can ſend out fleets which *France* is not in condition to oppoſe.

The high-flyers are therefore to be conſidered as a party, to which the junctures of the time are not

at all favorable, and conſequently it ſhould be their intereſt to remain in a ſtate of inaction, till time ſhould produce ſome opportunity to exert themſelves. But to be quiet in no part of their character. They cannot poſſibly be eaſy, while they ſee themſelves excluded from all places of honor and profit, which probably are the ſprings of their motions. It is however certain, that the diſturbances raiſed by them from time to time to very little purpoſe, are attended with great injury to themſelves, as well as to all the tories in general, who are always charged with the faults and paſſions of thoſe who are looked upon as their leaders. This very conſideration induces ſome to deſert their party.

As to the three other branches of the tories, namely, the moderate, the rigid, and the low, it would be folly in the whigs to think of their ruin by violent methods. This could not be effected without overturning the kingdom. They may indeed exclude them from public poſts and imployments. But if they ſhould be ſo imprudent as to meddle with the church of *England*, they would ruin the hazard of raiſing a ſtorm, which might coſt them the ſuperiority they at preſent enjoy. Therefore it is the intereſt of the whigs to leave the church unmoleſted, and their conduct ſhows they are perfectly convinced of this truth. Though they have lately had frequent provocations, it is not ſeen that now, they are in power, they ſeek to be revenged on the epiſcopal party. On the contrary, their grand aim is to divide that party if poſſible, from the reſt of the tories, by convincing them that they bear no ill-will to the church. If they could ſucceed, their victory over the high-flyers would be certain. But theſe laſt, ſenſible of the prejudice which this conduct does them, indeavor to prevent it's effect by always ingaging the church with their quarrel, and inſpiring the people with continual fears of the deſigns of the whigs againſt the church.

Having ſhown the views, ſtrength and intereſt of the tory party, I am next to ſpeak of the four branches of the whigs. As to the republican-whigs, they are at preſent very inconſiderable, and their party daily diminiſhes. There is not the leaſt probability of their ever finding again an opportunity like that during the troubles of *Charles* I's reign.

I have already obſerved that the principal difference between the moderate whigs and tories is, that the latter are more inclined to the king's prerogatives, and the former to the privileges of the ſubject. But this prevents not their union when the ſtate is in danger. Were the moderate tories not epiſcopalians, and had the moderate whigs fewer preſbyterians among them, it might be hoped that theſe two branches, of whigs and tories would remain for ever united, as they ſeem to be ſince the death of king *William*. But when I ſay that the one incline more to the king, and the others to the ſubject, I ſpeak the truth, and not what they ſay themſelves. The two parties affirm, on the contrary, they have no other aim, than the preſervation of the government as eſtabliſhed many ages. So to hear them, you would think they form, and always have formed one and the ſame party. It is however but too true, that their different inclination frequently obliges them to divide though it is to be preſumed their intentions, are equally good, and that they differ only in the means they imploy. The one perhaps are two jealous of the increaſe of the royal prerogative, and the others fear it not enough. But it is religion which chiefly makes them to be conſidered as different parties, becauſe the one is compoſed wholly of epiſcopalians, and the other has a great mixture of preſbyterians. Now to ſeparate the intereſts of the church from thoſe of the ſtate, requires abſtractions of which all are not capable. Nevertheleſs it may be affirmed, that the branch of the moderate whigs conſidered ſeparately, and

in itſelf, is not leſs powerful than that of the moderate tories. But when both join together, they form a party which would be reſiſtleſs, if religion were out of the queſtion. The great buſineſs therefore of the moderate whigs is to aſſiſt the people as much as poſſible, to diſcern the intereſts of the church from thoſe of the ſtate; for which purpoſe they are to treat the epiſcopalians with great moderation. Nor ought they to be leſs careful how they liſten to the republican-whigs, for fear of alarming the moderate tories, of whom they have frequent occaſion. But on the hand, nothing ought to be neglected by them for breaking the meaſures of the high-flyers, who are their real enemies. Such is the courſe they muſt take to preſerve their credit.

I proceed now to the church-whigs, who are divided into two branches, of which the firſt is of the rigid preſbyterians, who abſolutely reject not only the hierarchy, but moreover every ceremony practiſed in the church of *England*. Their number is very great in *England*, but they are ſtill more conſiderable by having all *Scotland* for them. They are continually laboring the propagation of preſbyterianiſm, and on ſome occaſions the leading whigs to content them, are obliged to take ſome ſteps prejudicial to the whole party. It is eaſy to conceive that the intereſt of the rigid preſbyterians requires an innovation in the eſtabliſhed religion, becauſe it can only be by ſome great revolution that their own can come to be uppermoſt. Wherefore they are conſidered as dangerous men, and very unfit to head the whig-party, who in all appearance, would be ill conducted by ſuch leaders.

Laſtly, There is another branch of church-whigs, which includes the moderate preſbyterians, and to which may be added all the reſt of the non-conformiſts, as quakers, anabaptiſts, *&c.* who find more ſupport from the whigs than from the tories, though their junction adds no great ſtrength to

the party. The moderate preſbyterians, leſs ſcrupulous, leſs paſſionate, and leſs obſtinate than the rigid, make no difficulty to join the aſſemblies of the eſtabliſhed church, and even to communicate therein when their intereſt requires it. If it were left to their choice, preſbyterianiſm would be the reigning religion. But they do not think it prudent to labor to make it ſo by violent methods. They know, it would be an infallible means to unite all the tories againſt them; whereas it is the intereſt of all the whigs to keep them divided, by continually inſiſting upon the diſtinction between ſtate and church-tories, and ſhowing that they have no ill deſign againſt the latter. Theſe are doubtleſs, the moſt dangerous enemies of the high-flyers and rigid tories, becauſe by their moderate conduct they deprive them of the pretence to complain that the church is in danger. Theſe were aimed at by the tories in their act, towards the concluſion of queen *Anne's* reign, againſt occaſional conformity. As few are acquainted with the nature of this act, I ſhall briefly explain it.

In the reign of *Charles* II. an act was made called the *conformity act*, whereby any perſon admitted to any public office was to bring a certificate of his having received the ſacrament in the church of *England*. The intent of this act was to exclude all non-conformiſts from places of any kind. Indeed, it produced this effect with regard to the rigid preſbyterians who could not reſolve to receive the communion from the hands of a biſhop, or a miniſter of the epiſcopal church. But the moderate preſbyterians were not ſo ſcrupulous. On their admiſſion to any poſt, they ſcrupled not to receive the communion in an epiſcopal church, and to take the proper certificates. It was not poſſible for the tories to add any explication to this act during the reign of king *James*, who on the contrary, granted an univerſal liberty of conſcience, nor in the lifetime of king *William*, or the firſt years of queen

Anne. But having the power in their hands at the concluſion of her reign, they were not contented with reviving this act, but added to it a claule to prevent occaſional conformity, or the communicating in the church of *England* on account of ſome employment. This excluded not only the rigid but alſo the moderate preſbyterians from all public offices: For by this act, which is ſtill in force, to communicate once in an epiſcopal church, is not a ſufficient qualification for a place, as before, but a man muſt ſhow that he is really a member of the church of *England.* If the whigs who at preſent prevail, dared to meddle with this act, it would ſoon be repealed. But for reaſons before intimated, very probably it will be ſuffered to ſubſiſt, and it's violation only connived at.

The ſtrength of the two parties being ſuch as we have ſeen, and the intereſt of the ſeveral branches ſo oppoſite, it ſeems to me a natural conſequence, that the placing a popiſh prince upon the throne while the king and parliament are in union, and the rights of the church are untouched, is a thing almoſt impoſſible. The people may from time to time be deluded by imaginary fears of the church's danger. But this deluſion muſt quickly vaniſh, when it is ſeen that the church is not really attacked. Now if religion is not concerned, that is, if the epiſcopalians do not think themſelves under an abſolute neceſſity of trying all ways to ſave their church from ruin, the endeavors in favor of the pretender, will prove ineffectual. As often as it ſhall be attempted to place him on the throne, the moderate ſtate and church-tories will join the whigs, and then that party will be too ſtrong for the high-flyers, though in matter of religion, they ſhould be joined by all the rigid tories, which however is not very likely. For it muſt not be imagined, becauſe a few rigid tories make a great noiſe, that the whole branch wiſh to ſee a popiſh prince on the throne. They are zealous for their church, but their church

is proteſtant, and this very zeal ſuffers them not to indanger their religion. It will be ſaid perhaps that *France* will aſſiſt the high-flyers with all her forces. This is what I can hardly believe for reaſons I ſhall mention hereafter. But though *France* ſhould heartily ingage in this undertaking, the execution would be difficult on account of the ſituation and naval power of *England*. Nothing but a ſurprize can produce the effect deſired by the high-flyers, papiſts, and ſome rigid tories. However, the attempt lately made, will probably induce the king and parliament to take good precautions againſt ſuch ſurprizes for the future.

There is ſtill another everlaſting obſtacle to the eſtabliſhment of a popiſh prince, and that is, the poſſeſſion of ſome part of the lands of the monaſteries, ſuppreſſed by *Henry* VIII, by almoſt every noted family in *England*. The anceſtors of the preſent poſſeſſors either received them in preſents from the king, or purchaſed them at an eaſy rate. If therefore a popiſh prince ſhould now mount the throne, there is no doubt but he would try to eſtabliſh his religon. But ſhould his attempt prove ſucceſsful, in what danger would theſe eſtates be? In all probability the preſent owners would be diſpoſſeſſed. Nay, who knows whether they would not be called to account for the profits? It is therefore manifeſt, that the tories and whigs have an equal intereſt in the prevention of this danger. If the advocates for a popiſh prince were to be ſtrictly examined, it would be found, without doubt, either they have no poſſeſſions of this kind, or believe they have particular reaſons to flatter themſelves with an exemption from the general law, or with being made amends ſome other way.

I am now to give a more diſtinct idea of the two parties of whigs and tories, by ſhowing their reſpective characters.

The tories in general are fierce and haughty. The whigs are treated by them with the utmoſt

contempt, and even with rigor when they have the ſuperiority. As the tory party is compoſed of epiſcopalians, who properly make the body of the nation, they look upon themſelves as the prevailing party, and cannot bear an equality, much leſs a ſuperiority, in their adverſaries. I cannot better compare the behavior of the tories to the whigs, than to that of the *Roman* catholicks to the proteſtants in countries where the papiſts have the advantage of number, and the ſupport of the government. It is with regret that the tories allow the preſbyterians liberty of conſcience. When the power is in their hands they ſeldom failed to prohibit their aſſemblies, and to exclude them from public employments by acts of parliament. The laſt years of queen *Anne* afforded flagrant inſtances of the haughtineſs of this party.

There is ſtill another character which belongs to them. They are exceeding paſſionate and precipitate in their motions. This often diſconcerts all their projects. When they have the reins in their hands they drive with amazing rapidity. Very remarkable proofs of this were ſeen under *Charles* II. *James* II. and the late queen. Nevertheleſs it muſt be confeſſed that this rapidity is not always the effect of an impetuous paſſion, but is ſometimes founded in policy. As the high-flyers, who are commonly at the head of the party, ſometimes projeſt the alteration of the government, they are obliged to embrace, with great haſte, the opportunities which offer, becauſe theſe opportunities are naturally tranſient. For inſtance, under *Charles* II. it was neceſſary to put a ſpeedy ſtop to the progreſs of the whigs, for fear the king, who was with ſome difficulty, and for other intereſts than his own, ingaged in the plot, ſhould alter his mind. Beſides, there was no time to loſe, becauſe it was well known that the whigs were laboring with all their power to inform the people of the true deſigns of the court. So again, when *James* II. aſcend-

ed the throne, the presumptive heir to the crown was his eldest daughter the princess of *Orange*, who was firmly attached to the protestant religion. Wherefore as the king might die without sons, all his projects would vanish by his death, if his work was not finished during his life. It was necessary therefore to make haste, because the like opportunity would probably never offer again after his death. For the same reason, queen *Anne* being childless when she put the ministry into the hands of the high-flyers, a peace was quickly to be concluded with *France*, and speedy measures taken for securing the crown to the pretender, least her death should prevent the execution of their projects, as it really happened. It was undoubtedly on this account that a peace was so hastily concluded with *Lewis* XIV. because his assistance was thought necessary to accomplish the work. Probably, if the queen had lived a little longer, the act of succession had been repealed. But this precipitation which seems so necessary to the tories, is, on the other hand, prejudicial to them, inasmuch as it too soon discovers the designs of their leaders, which require a gradual execution. In order to succeed, they must have a long and peaceable reign, a king favorable to their designs, and of great ability, or at least ready to be guided by their counsels.

Another character of the tories is, their change of principles as their party prevails or is humbled. When they have the prince on their side, the doctrine of passive obedience is supported with all their power, and every ordinance of the king is to be obeyed without examination, because then, they would have the whigs suffer themselves to be oppressed without any resistance. But when the government is in the hands of the contrary party, this doctrine lies dormant or is forgotten. Thus, in all the tory-writers who have transmitted the troubles of the reign of *Charles* I. passive obedience is established as a principle certain and inconest-

able. This is owing to their intention of repreſenting the meaſures of the parliament for their own defence, and in oppoſition to the deſigns of the king, as a horrible rebellion. When the preſbyterians were perſecuted in *Charles* II's reign, paſſive-obedience was every where talked of. But it was ſtill much worſe under *James* II. I remember to have heard from the pulpit, the conſequences of this doctrine carried as far, and perhaps farther than ever they were in *France*, under *Lewis* XIV. Great ſtreſs was laid upon a canon of a convocation of the church of *England*, which imported, that armies taken up againſt the king by the ſubject, on any pretenſe whatſoever, is direct rebellion: That whether the ſubject be upon the offenſive or defenſive, he is clearly condemned by St. *Paul*, who ſays, *he ſhall receive to himſelf damnation*. But the convocation in which this canon was made, was held under archbiſhop *Laud*, when *Charles* I. governed in an abſolute manner, a little before the beginning of the troubles. But when king *William* was on the throne, the doctrine of paſſive-obedience was no longer inforced, becauſe that king was conſidered as no friend to the tories. The caſe was the ſame under queen *Anne*, while the miniſtry was compoſed of whigs, and moderate tories. But the doctrine revived when that princeſs delivered herſelf up to the conduct of the high-flyers. But ſince king *George* has filled the throne, the high-flyers and rigid tories plainly ſhow, this doctrine is only admitted by them when they have a prince of their party, but is rejected without any ſcruple when the government is not for them. For this purpoſe they have a diſtinction ready between a king *de jure*, and a king *de facto*, and maintain that only the king *de jure* has a title to this obedience, but ſuch is every king who favors them, whether he is upon the throne, or has only pretenſions to it.

Let us now ſpeak of the character of the whigs. Thoſe of this party who are rigid preſbyterians, are a ſtubborn and obſtanate generation, who perhaps would be as hot and as paſſionate as the tories were they in poſſeſſion of power. But as, ſince the long parliament, the party has never been under their direction, it is not upon them that we are to form the general character of the whigs, whrereas that of the tories is to be taken principally from the high-flyers and rigid tories, who are their leaders and directors.

The heads of the whig-party, are much more moderate than the leaders of the tories. Beſides, they proceed generally upon fixed principles, from which they never ſwerve, except when they are obliged to give ſome ſatisfaction to the preſbyterians to keep them from deſponding. Far from deſiring, like the tories, to carry things with a high hand, they advance gradually, without heat or violence. Their greateſt trouble is to curb the paſſion of ſome among them, who, were they unreſtrained, would quickly ruin the party. By this moderation, they try to inſinuate mildly into the people, that they have no ill deſigns againſt the church of *England*, in order to ſeparate the church-tories from the high-flyers. As it is the intereſt of the tories to confound all the branches of their party, and unite them into one body, to be directed by the leaders; ſo it is the buſineſs of the whigs to have theſe ſeveral branches diſtinguiſhed, that the epiſcopalians may be prevented from promoting the deſigns of the high-flyers. But they would never be able to gain this point were they to uſe violence. Thus the gentleneſs and moderation of the whigs is no leſs founded in policy, than the haſtineſs and precipitation of the tories.

The whigs are charged with being greedy of riches and honors, and ungrateful to their adherents, which makes their friends often forſake them. I can ſay nothing to this, not being ſuffici-

ently informed of the particular concerns of the party. Beſides, the examination of this charge would lead me to conſider the conduct of thoſe who think themſelves ill uſed, which I avoid, as contrary to my intent of confining myſelf to general ideas. However, it may be ſaid for the moderate whigs, that generally they ſupport a good cauſe, namely, the conſtitution of the government as eſtabliſhed by law. They err indeed ſometimes through too much care and diſtruſt, which throws them now and then upon proceedings contrary to their true intereſt, and their own principles, ſince on certain occaſions they maintain the privileges of the nation and parliament at the expence of the royal authority.

As to the eccleſiaſtical whigs, who are no other than the preſbyterians, all that can be ſaid of them, is, that they are extremely prejudiced againſt biſhops, and the whole hierarchy. Now the queſtion is, whether this prejudice be well grounded, or being ſo, whether it affords juſt cauſe for ſeparation. For my part, I look upon this diſpute between the epiſcopalians and preſbyterians as of little conſequence. And therefore I cannot approve of the ſtiffneſs of the preſbyterians in a country where the reformation is eſtabliſhed according to the church of *England*, ſince the two churches differ in no eſſential point. I ſay the ſame thing of the epiſcopalians of *Scotland*, and perhaps in *England* itſelf, greater regard ſhould be had of the ſcruples of the preſbyterians. But this is only my private opinion, which I do not pretend to give for a rule to the one or the other.

Before I proceed, it will be proper to obviate an objection which may naturally occur to the reader, namely, that every thing in *England* being done by way of parliaments, theſe unions above mentioned, whether of the branches of the ſame party, or of the branches of the two different parties, ſeem to no purpoſe, unleſs made in the parliament itſelf between the members. But ſo far are ſuch unions

from taking place in the parliament, that one of the parties generally ſo prevails there, as to render the union of the reſt of the members intirely fruitleſs.

To this I anſwer, firſt, that the parliament conſiſting of two houſes, whereof that of the lords remains always the ſame without any conſiderable change, theſe unions may take place in that houſe whoſe principles are not ſo variable as thoſe of the commons. Now as the upper houſe has power to throw out the bills ſent up by the lower, it follows that the lords, by means of ſuch unions may break the commons meaſures, conſequently their unions may produce great effects.

Secondly, Theſe unions may influence the elections of members. For inſtance, on ſuſpicion that a popiſh prince is intended to be ſet on the throne, the moderate tories and low-church-men may join with the whigs, and cauſe ſuch repreſentatives to be choſen as are againſt what is feared, and thereby break the meaſures of the high-flyers and rigid tories.

Thirdly, Even in a houſe of commons, conſiſting moſtly of tory-members, the moderate among them ſeeing ſome deſign in hand prejudicial to the nation, may join with the whigs and hinder the execution of it. The moderate whigs might alſo unite with the tories, if they ſaw the republican party growing two ſtrong.

It muſt however be owned that party-ſpirit, the cabals of the leading-men, the intrigues of the court, the intereſt of particular perſons, have but too much influence upon the debates of parliament. to ſay all in a word, the parliament is compoſed of men who are not free from paſſions. If the parliament were to anſwer the idea which thoſe conceive of it who are not thoroughly acquainted with it's nature, it ſhould be compoſed of perfect men. But as that is impoſſible, it would be proper, at leaſt, to to reform certain abuſes, for which hitherto no remedy has been found. or perhaps ſought. Though this leads me a little from my ſubject, I ſhall ſtay a

moment and take the liberty to point out ſome of theſe abuſes. This may at leaſt ſerve to give a more extenſive knowledge of the *Engliſh* conſtitution, which, though excellent in it's nature, is however liable to ſome imperfections.

The firſt abuſe lies in the two great influence of the court in the election of members. This influence is viſibly owing to the diviſion between the whigs and tories, which gives the king an advantage, he would doubtleſs not have, were all the people well united. When one of the parties gets into the miniſtry, the lieutenances of the counties and all the court-places are confered on perſons devoted to them. After which a new parliament is called. Then, beſides the money privately diſtributed by the miniſtry, if report is to be credited, thoſe that are in authority in the towns and counties, uſe all their intereſt and ſkill, to get members choſen favorable to the court, that the miniſtry may have a ſuperiority of votes in the houſe of commons. We may judge of the effect of theſe intrigues by this ſingle conſideration, that commonly there is a whig parliament when the miniſtry is ſo, and a tory parliament when the miniſtry are tories. Nevertheleſs, the thing is not ſo very certain, but that we find ſometimes moſt of the elections carried againſt the court, but this rarely happens, unleſs the nation in general are ſatisfied that the court has deſigns pernicious to the ſtate, or the liberties of the ſubject. I ſay nothing of our ſeeing in the late reign twelve peers created at once, with the ſole view of procuring the court a majority of votes in the houſe of lords. This is a palpable as well as a very dangerous abuſe.

Another abuſe lies in many ſmall boroughs having a right to ſend repreſentatives to parliament, whoſe votes have the ſame weight with thoſe of the members of *London* and *Weſtminſter*, notwithſtanding the great diſproportion between the electors of the one and the other. In theſe inconſiderable

boroughs, by the influence of the court, members are choſen that have not a foot of land near the place. It is pretended by ſome that theſe boroughs have a right as ancient as the parliament itſelf, having enjoyed it ever ſince the time of the *Anglo-Saxons*. Others think it of much later date. But however, it is at preſent a monſtrous abuſe, that villages of four or five thatched houſes, ſhould be upon the level in parliament with the largeſt cities of the kingdom.

A third abuſe there is of great importance, and which ought to be reformed, ſince it is in ſome meaſure contrary to *magna charta*, on which the *Engliſh* found their liberties and privileges. In this charter, king *John* promiſes to expreſs terms, for himſelf and ſucceſſors, to declare beforehand the cauſes of calling a parliament. As long as this cuſtom was obſerved, the points debated in parliament were not many, for which the members came prepared, and the ſeſſions laſted but a few days. If this was obſerved now, the boroughs and counties might give their repreſentatives inſtructions upon the affairs for which the parliament ſhould be called, or at leaſt, might chuſe ſuch members as are of the ſame ſentiments of the electors. But at preſent, ſeveral abuſes ſpring from the non-obſervance of this method.

In the firſt place, the ſeſſions hold as long as the king pleaſes, and are ended when he thinks proper. *Henry* IV. improved this advantage by keeping the parliament aſſembled, till the deſired ſubſidy was granted. In the next place, the electors not knowing the buſineſs on which the parliament is to proceed, are forced to give their repreſentatives an unlimited power. Hence ariſes another abuſe, that the repreſentatives of a borough or county, are often of a contrary opinion to thoſe that ſend them. It may therefore happen, nay, it has frequently happened, that the reſolves of the lower houſe are directly oppoſite to the ſentiments of

the people who they repreſent. So it is not the people or commons of *England* that ſhare the legiſlative power with the king and peers, but their repreſentatives who enjoy a privilege which belongs only to the people in general, to whom however they are not accountable for their conduct. All they can ſuffer, in caſe they have acted contrary to the ſenſe of their borough or county, is not to be choſen another time. This ſeems therefore, to be lodging too great a power in bare repreſentatives. It was not ſo in *France*, when the ſtatesof thatkingdom were convened. Every province drew up, before-hand, their particular inſtructions, from which there deputies were not allowed to ſwerve. In like manner, in important affairs to be debated by the ſtates general of the *united provinces*, the deputies receive inſtructions from their provinces; and in the particular ſtates of each province, the magiſtrates of the towns give their orders and inſtructions to their deputies.

A fourth abuſe lies in the public canvaſſins at the time of elections, with great expenſe. It coſts ſome men ſeveral thouſands of pounds to be elected, and this openly in the face of all the world.

Laſtly, There is another ſort of abuſe in the houſe of commons, namely, that the members are allowed to go and come or abſent themſelves as they pleaſe, except on certain great occaſions, ſo that of five hundred and thirteen members, (if I miſtake not,) there are not preſent ſometimes above one hundred and fifty. This makes it much more eaſy for the parties, to cabal, than if the houſe were full. Moreover many members, though in *London*, do not conſtantly attend the houſe, but keep away upon any the ſlighteſt affair of their own. This puts me in mind of a pleaſent ſtory, with which I ſhall cloſe this digreſſion. A whig member telling one of the ſame party in great anger, "That if he had been at the houſe that morning, "they ſhould have carried an important point."

The other calmly aſked him, "By how many they "loſt it? By one ſingle vote," ſays he. The other replies, "Had I been there, we ſhould have loſt it "by four, for there would have been four tories "more, whom I have kept all this morning on "purpoſe at a tavern."

It remains only that I briefly ſpeak of the intereſts of the neighbouring ſtates, with regard to the whigs and tories. Though the differences between the two parties ſeem only to reſpect *England*, they have a great influence on the affairs of the other ſtates. The peace of *Utrecht* clearly ſhows of what conſequence they are to all *Europe*.

Every one knows that the ſtates-general of the united provinces are friends of the whigs, and very juſtly, ſince the whigs have all along ſupported their intereſt in *England*. The whigs obliged *Charles* II. to make a peace with *Holland*, when he was in league with *Lewis* XIV. again her. From that time, they have ever conſidered the intereſt of the *Dutch* as their own. Accordingly in their turn they have received ſignal ſervices from them, particularly in the aſſiſtance given be the ſtates-general to the prince of *Orange*, to go and break king *James*'s meaſures. This good underſtanding is ſtill cultivated, ſo that the *Dutch* may be ſaid to be whigs, and the whigs to be *Dutch*. The reaſon of this union is evident. For *France*, perpetual enemy of *Holland*, ever ſupported the tories; whence it follows, that *Holland* is obliged to ſtand by the whigs, ſince ſhe cannot expect aſſiſtance form *England*, but by their means. This is ſo clear, that it needs no farther illuſtration.

For the ſame reaſon, the emperor, as ſovereign of the *Netherlands* ought to be a friend to the whigs. As he muſt look upon the king of *France*. as a very formidable and dangerous neighbour, he can expect the aſſiſtance of the *Engliſh*, in caſe his dominions are invaded, but when the whigs are in power. In all appearence, the tories would not

exert themſelves in the defence of the *Netherlands* againſt the invaſions of *France*. But, ſhould the emperor, through exceſſive zeal for his religion, lend his forces to the pretender to aſcend the throne of *England*, he would render *France* ſtill more powerful, and add to the ballance of *Europe* a weight which would make it entirely incline to one ſide.

The intereſts of *France* with regard to the whigs and tories, afford matter for many more obſervations. In general, it is doubtleſs the intereſts of that crown to cultivate a good underſtanding with *England*. Since the growth of the houſe of *Auſtria*, that is, ſince about two hundred years, *England* has ever had it in her power to incline the ballance either on the ſide of *Auſtria* or on the ſide of *France* as ſhe pleaſed. But it has been her ſtanding intereſt to keep the ballance even between theſe two powers. This has been the hinge on which all the policy of the kings of *England* has turned, for two centuries. *Henry* VIII's varying ſometimes from this courſe is to be aſcribed wholly to the private intereſt of cardinal *Wolſey* his prime miniſter, or to his own caprice. So it was ever the intereſt of *France* to keep fair with *England*. Accordingly *Lewis* XIV. has politicly endeavored theſe fifty years, either to get *England* on his ſide, or at leaſt, to prevent her from eſpouſing that of his enemies. But as it was not eaſy for that monarch to perſuade the *Engliſh* that to incline the ballance to his ſide was for their advantage, he confined his endeavors to hinder them from concerning themſelves in the affairs of *Europe* to the end he might proceed without any oppoſition from them. But it muſt be obſerved, that this policy reſpected only his vaſt deſigns of enſlaving all *Europe*. Otherwiſe he would have had no need to trouble himſelf about the *Engliſh*. To ſet this matter in a clearer light, it will not be amiſs to ſhow briefly how this monarch managed with regard to *England*.

Lewis XIV, as every one knows, formed the project for an univerſal monarchy in *Europe*. As he was not ignorant that *England* was concerned to keep the ballance of *Europe* even, and that the *Engliſh* conſidered this maxim as the chief foundation of their ſecurity, he was juſtly apprehenſive of their oppoſing the execution of his deſigns. For prevention of which, he uſed all his addreſs to gain *Charles* II. to his intereſt, when he had reſolved upon a war with *Holland* in 1672. The miniſtry being tory he drew *Charles* by their means, into a league with him. But this league was of no long cotinuance. It was ſo evidently againſt the intereſt of *England*, that the parliament obliged the king to make peace with *Holland*. Nay, they would have conſtrained him to declare againſt *France*, if a proſpect of an approaching peace between that crown and the ſtates-general, had not hindered them from going ſo far.

The peace of *Nimeguen*, concluded in 1678, cauſed not the king of *France* to diſcontinue the proſecution of his grand deſigns. But as he was very ſenſible king *Charles* would not have it in his power to follow his own inclination, he reſolved to take another method, in order to diſable *England* at leaſt from interpoſing in the affairs of *Europe*. And that was to raiſe troubles in the kingdom, and then to foment them, that the *Engliſh* might be employed at home. The duke of *York*'s plots, the king his brother's eaſineſs to be guided by his counſels, the choice of paſſionate and perhaps corrupt miniſters, proceeded, in all appearance, from *Lewis*'s ſecret practices in *England*. This method ſucceeded to his wiſh. The conſpiracy diſcovered by *Titus Oates*, the pretended proteſtant-plot, the perſecution of the preſbyterians, the people's murmurs, the diſcord between the king and the parliament, found the *Engliſh* ſo much employment at home, that it was not poſſible for them to look abroad. In the mean time, *Lewis* XIV. was rendering himſelf form-

idable to all *Europe*, having nothing to fear from the *Engliſh* who remained idle, when they ſhould have uſed their utmoſt endeavors to put a ſtop to his progreſs.

Upon the acceſſion of *James* II. to the throne, *Lewis* gave not over a method that had proved ſo ſucceſsful. On the contrary, he preſſed the new king of *England* to execute the projects he had formed when duke of *York*, in favor of popery and arbitrary power. He new theſe two points were ſufficient to keep *England* long employed; however, as his aim was only to embroil the nation, he never aſſiſted king *James* to any purpoſe. The too ſudden execution of the prince's deſigns was not for his intereſt. When he ſaw him on the point of being attacked by the prince of *Orange*, he never ſtirred in his defence, but rather made uſe of the juncture to carry war into *Germany*. He imagined that the troubles he had raiſed in *England* would long diſable that kingdom from oppoſing his ambitious deſigns. This was the ſole end of all his proceedings. Afterwards, when king *William* proclaimed war againſt him, he ſent king *James* into *Ireland* with ſeven thouſand men, an aid too weak to reſtore him to his throne, but ſufficient to make a diverſion, and feed the hopes of the mal-contents. Thus is it demonſtrable from *Lewis*'s whole conduct, that his ſole intention was to embroil *England*, and that king *James* was the dupe of his policy. It ſeems however at firſt ſight, that king *James*'s reſtoration would have been for *Lewis*'s advantage. But moſt aſſuredly it was againſt his intereſt for a king of *England* to be at peace in his dominions. The reaſon is plain; as it is the intereſt of *England* to keep the ballance even in *Europe*, *Lewis*, who had formed vaſt projects, would have been in danger of being oppoſed by a king of *England*, who having no diſtractions at home, might in the end purſue his true intereſts, or be forced to it by his parliament. And therefore, *Lewis* XIV. has been ſatisfied to keep *England* embroiled, and for that

purpoſe, to hold ſecret correſpondence with the leading tories, who at length have diſcovered themſelves in the laſt years of queen *Anne*.

It ſeems therefore to be the *French* king's intereſt to preſerve a good underſtanding with the tories, in order, by their means, to foment the troubles in *England*. This is ſtrictly true, when he forms deſigns againſt the reſt of *Europe*. But if he aims to live in peace, and ſtand upon his defence, in caſe of invaſion, nothing can be more for his advantage than to cultivate the king of *England*'s friendſhip, according to the the conſtant maxim of *Lewis*'s predeceſſors, whether the miniſtry be whig or tory. *France* may now be ſaid to be invincible, as long as *England* declares not againſt her. But if the king *England* is provoked, and enters into a new alliance with *Holland* and *Germany*, the laſt war's experience ſhows that *France* is very far from being invincible. It may therefore be affirmed, that if the illuſtrious prince now at the helm of the *French* affairs, intends not to purſue the vaſt deſigns of *Lewis* XIV. it is not his intereſt to cheriſh the troubles of *England*, which, inſtead of being for his advantage, may greatly turn to his prejudice. I confeſs in the indirect aſſiſtance given the pretender in *France*, the regent's proceedings ſeem to deſtroy the maxim I mean to advance. Time will unfold, perhaps the myſtery of this policy. But in the mean while, I cannot forbear thinking that he is miſinformed of the true ſtate of the two parties in *England*, and has given too much credit to intereſted and prejudiced perſons. Perhaps, the pretender himſelf has been deceived in the ſame manner.

I have but one obſervation more to make, with which I ſhall conclude what I have to ſay concerning the whigs and the tories. In ſpeaking of their ſeveral views, intereſts and characters, I pretend not to include every particular perſon of either party, but only their leaders and managers, with ſome of the moſt activeof both ſides. Though

the people in general, by inclination, or intereſt, are either whigs or tories, it does not follow that every ſingle perſon acts in the views I have aſcribed to them. It is certain moſt ſuffer themſelves to be led without knowing where it is intended to conduct them, or examining the courſe preſcribed them. Conſequently they are far from being concerned in the intrigues and cabals of their leaders. Such a one has liſted himſelf a tory, as being attached to the church of *England*, and afterwards, without knowing how, finds himſelf obliged to maintain the principles of the high-flyers and rigid tories, though contrary to his inclination. There are thouſands of good *Engliſhmen*, without doubt, who grieve to ſee their country thus rent with diviſions, and would gladly embrace all expedients to put a ſtop to them. But it is not eaſy to obſerve a juſt neutrality, becauſe it is difficult to be without ambition and avarice. Thoſe who ſtand neuter, as I ſaid, are neither preferred nor truſted, by reaſon that one of the parties are always in power, and have nothing more at heart than the advancing their friends, or gaining ſome of their adverſaries. Conſequently there can be no poſts or offices for men, from whom the prevailing party can expect no manner of ſervice. Moreover, how can a man be neuter between to parties, each of whom repreſent their adverſaries as deſigning thoſe evils which are moſt apt to fill men with fears, I mean, the deſtruction of the religion they profeſs, and the diſſolution of a government, which alone, in their opinion, can render ſubjects happy? A man muſt be very inſenſible not to be moved, with ſuch dangers, when convinced of their reality.

All *Engliſhmen* therefore are not to bear the blame of theſe unnatural diviſions, but only thoſe who cheriſh them for their own private intereſt. Who are they that would inveſt the king with abſolute power? Who are they that would debar free-born ſubjects of liberty of conſcience? Who are they,

in a word, that labor to introduce popery? Can it be ſaid that theſe are the views of every particular tory? No, by no means. But they are the aims of the leaders, who, for their own ends, ſeduce the poor people, and make no ſcruple to involve them in the danger of a civil war.

It may be affirmed, that it is not the kingdom's intereſt for one of the parties to become ſo ſuperior as to meet with no oppoſition. Should it be the high-flyers, they would introduce arbitrary power. And if it were the moderate tories, their biaſs to the prerogative of the crown, would at length enable the ſovereign to ſhake off the galling yoke of parliaments. Were it poſſible for the papiſts to be ſuperior, *England* would ſoon looſe her religion and liberty. On the other hand, if the republican-whigs ſhould recover the advantage they have loſt, you would hear no more of the kingdom but the commonwealth of *England*, as in *Cromwell*'s days. Laſtly, were the moredate whigs to have the management, they would ſo guard againſt the incroachments of the regal power, that the ſovereign would be reduced to the condition of a doge of *Venice*.

As for the two parties with regard to religion, it is certain, if the preſbyterians can ever act without controle, they will not be ſatisfied till the hierarchy of the church of *England* be entirely demoliſhed. But then, if the rigid epiſcopalians have nothing to ballance their power, the preſbyterians muſt expect to be openly perſecuted. And who knows whether they will ſuffer them to enjoy a bare liberty of conſcience?

Aſſuredly the welfare of the kingdom conſiſts not in any of the ends propoſed by the leaders of both parties. The only way to reſtore peace and tranquillity, would be to leave the government upon it's ancient foot, and the church, as eſtabliſhed at the reformation. It would alſo be neceſſary to grant a toleration to the preſbyterians who are very numerous in the kingdom. If this way be

not uſed, it will always be better for the ſtate that the people remain in diviſion, than if one of the parties ſhould require a ſuperiority, which would be more fatal to the public than the equality which cheriſhes diſcord. I do not ſee what can put an end to this ſort of civil war, but the prudence of a juſt and equitable ſovereign, moderate in his deſires and paſſions, a lover of the proteſtant religion, and that makes the good and happineſs of his ſubjects his ſole care and ſtudy. This is what may with reaſon be expected from the king who now fills the throne, ſince he poſſeſſes all thoſe virtues in an eminent degree. May heaven proſper his deſigns, and may he live to ſee the happy effects of his pains and endeavors!

E N D.

Juſt Publiſhed, and to be Sold at
GREENLEAF'S Printing-Office, in *Hanover-Street*, BOSTON.

AN abridgment of *Burn*'s juſtice of the peace, and pariſh officer. To which is added, an appendix, containing ſome general rules and directions, neceſſary to be known and obſerved by all juſtices of the peace.

Subſcribers for ſaid book, are deſired to call or ſend for them.

N. B. This abridgment includes all that is applicable to the practice here, and may be had for nine ſhillings ſtitched, and eleven ſhillings bound. The *London* edition of this book cannot be had under ſix dollars. Alſo to be ſold at ſaid office, The following pamphlets, *viz.*

A diſſent from the church of *England* fully juſtified, being the diſſenting gentleman's three letters to Mr. *White*.

A calm anſwer to the queſtion, Why are you a diſſenter from the church of *England*?

The caſe of the diſſenting miniſters, by Mr. *Mauduit*.

England's warning piece; a ſermon occaſioned by the murder of Mr. *William Allen*, by a party of ſoldiers in George's Fields.

An anniverſary ſermon, being a ſequal to the above.

The adulateur; a tragedy. By a lady.

Two ſermons, occaſioned by the condemnation and execution of *Levi Ames*. By the Rev. *Samuel Stillman*.

An oration on the beauties of liberty.

Almanack's for 1774. With a number of other pamphlets, teſtaments, pſalters, ſpelling books, pſalm books, primers, writing paper, ink pots and other ſtationary; alſo blanks of various ſorts, ſome never before printed, particularly for the uſe of juſtices of the peace.

The practice of churches in *New-England* relating to baptiſm, vindicated. By *J. Cotton*, A. M. of *Plymouth*. A reply to the ſame by Rev. Mr. *Robbins*, of *Plymouth*. ALSO, ſubſcriptions are taken in, for an anſwer to the reply of Mr. *Robbins*'s, by Mr. *Cotton*, at ſaid office, where the *printing buſineſs* is carried on with great care and dexterity.

E773
R218d